

THE  
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

---

MAY, 1850.

---

VOL. II.—NO. III.

---

THE ANABAPTISTS IN SWITZERLAND.

[From the unpublished History of the Reformed Church by the  
late Lewis Mayer, D. D.]

From *Germany* the spirit of fanaticism and misrule penetrated into *Switzerland*. There were not wanting in this country combustible materials that needed only a spark to kindle them into a conflagration. The peasantry, who lived upon the lands which belonged to churches and monasteries, had long groaned under the burden of tythes and rents, and of fees that were paid to these institutions for every spiritual function, and for every act to which a religious aspect could be given, besides other oppressive exactions, and in addition to the taxes for the support of the civil government : and they felt their burdens more, and were more impatient under them, when they observed how their hard earnings were consumed, by crowds of priests and monks, in a voluptuous and profligate idleness, and how they were treated by these insolent ecclesiastics with haughtiness and disdain. Like their brethren in *Germany*, they sighed for deliverance, and were ready to rise against their oppressors, as soon as a prospect of success should appear, or the sanctions of religion should give firmness and vigor to their desire. Intelligence of the German insurrections, and of the new prophets

who denounced the judgments of heaven upon the seats of power and iniquity, furnished the occasion, and gave the impulse for turbulent risings in the canton of *Zurich*, and other portions of the confederacy, and for clamorous demands of redress. But the prudent measures of government, which instituted investigations of the grounds of these complaints, and brought the authority of religion to bear upon them, the control which the government had already begun to exercise over the clergy and their institutions, and their sincere determination to reform all existing abuses, calmed the violence of the malcontents, and prevented further outbreaks. But the zealots in religious innovation were more troublesome.

A numerous class, which had subsisted under the Papacy, and had conformed to the established worship while the dread of the ecclesiastical power kept them in check, began to manifest their character when the spell of that power was broken, and liberty of thought upon every subject was restored by the reformation. They were restless spirits, men of sanguine tempers, possessing more excitability than intellect, and governed more by their feelings than by reason. These men were discontented with the tardy movements of the constituted authorities in abolishing Popish superstitions, and with the narrow limits within which the reformation was confined. Both the government and the preachers exerted themselves in vain to restrain them from excess. In some instances, as at the village of *Zollikon*, they took the law and the power into their own hands, and abolished the Popish images before the government had come to a decision respecting them. All these men were fit subjects for fanatical excitement, and when once put in motion by some external impulse, were not likely soon to stop.

Munzer came into contact with men of this character at *Waldshut* on the border of *Switzerland*, and kindled in their congenial minds something of his own enthusiasm for a pure church, a theocratic government, and divine inspirations; and from him they received their notions on the subject of infant baptism. Among these converts were Balthazer Hubmeyer, an evangelical preacher and pastor of a church in *Waldshut*, Conrad Grebel, and Felix Mantz, citizens of *Zurich*, who were men of education and of respectability. All these became distinguished leaders of the new sect. They did not at first act out the whole system of Munzer. Their first attempt was to gain over the reformers to their party. For this purpose Grebel, Mantz, and Simon Stump, pastor of the church at *Hoeng*, urged upon Zwingli and Leo Juda the expediency of forming

a church of Saints, into which no sinners should be admitted, where a perfect equality should reign, all things should be common to all, and tythes, rents, and other burdens should be abolished. The reformers replied by showing the inconsistency of such a scheme with the scriptural idea of the church of Christ, and respectfully declined to entertain it; in consequence of which the disaffected began to hold separate meetings, and now first denounced infant baptism, which they represented as a Popish corruption of the Church and an invention of the devil.<sup>1</sup> This was, at this time, the extent of their public dissent from the established order of the Church. Zwingli sought to convince them of their error, and in his conferences with them, the question was only whether infant baptism was consistent with the Scriptures; not whether it was valid where it had been administered to subjects in infancy: but they soon went farther and, carrying out their principle, maintained the necessity of re-baptizing those who had received infant baptism. Hubmeyer stil

<sup>1</sup> Zwingli's *Aussage von den Wiedertaüfern &c.*, in Füsli's *Beiträge zur Reform.* *Gesch. des Schweizerlandes*, vol. 1 p. 228, and note 45.—*Ibid* p. 197, note.

Grebel and Mantz were previously ill-disposed toward Zwingli, because they suspected him of having thwarted them in their plan to procure appointments in the contemplated seminary in Zurich. The council and the chapter had agreed, as we have already noticed, that the income of some of the canonries should be applied to the support of learned professors, after the decease of the present incumbents. These two men possessed respectable acquirements, particularly in the Greek and the Hebrew languages, and thought themselves, as citizens of honorable standing, entitled to professorships in these departments. But as the funds would not become available for the purpose during the life-time of the incumbents, it was impossible to meet their wishes immediately. On this account a beginning was first made with public lectures, in the summer of 1525, when Ceporinus, who had previously taught Hebrew without a salary, was appointed professor in that department; and Rudolph Collin, who was soon afterward elected Greek professor taught several years without a compensation, and supported himself in the mean time by reading lectures upon Homer to a private class, and by working at the business of rope-making! Grebel and Mantz would not wait for the convenient season, but would have several of the useless canons removed, and themselves put in their places, that they might enjoy both the dignity and the revenues of the canonships, and wished Zwingli to exert his influence in the council and in the chapter to have such an arrangement made. This he declined to do; and, as they thought the proposed arrangement practicable, and, probably, esteemed it right also, they hated Zwingli for refusing to second their ambitious project. This hostility to the reformer seems to have transferred itself to his reformation, and to have the more pre-disposed their minds for the reception of Munzer's opinions on baptism, or any thing that was opposed to Zwingli's system.—*See Füsli's Beiträge, &c.*, vol. 1 p. 191–194, note 36.

considered infants members of the church, agreeable to Matth. 19, v. 13, 14, and received them as such, when he refused to baptize them.<sup>1</sup> His own account of the matter is this: "Instead of baptizing them, I convene the church, bringing in the infant, and, in the vernacular tongue, expound the gospel: 'Little children were brought to him, &c.' Thereupon, the name being given, the whole church kneel and pray for the little one. But if the parents are yet infirm, and insist upon having their offspring baptized, I baptize it. In practice I am weak with those who are yet weak, until they be better informed; but in doctrine I do not yield the smallest particle."<sup>2</sup>

The practice of re-baptizing was introduced by Conrad Grebel at *Zurich*; for although the doctrine of re-baptism was taught by Munzer in *Germany*, the practice of it had its origin in *Zurich*, where Grebel was the first that baptized anew; and the first subject of the repetition of the rite was George Blaurock of *Coire*, who styled himself "George of the house of Jacob of Coire." Afterwards many were baptized in *Zollikon* by Blaurock and Mantz, and the practice became general.<sup>3</sup> This practice now was the badge of the new sect; and they were hence called *Anabaptists*, that is, *re-baptizers*. The rite was at first performed by sprinkling or affusion; which appears from the document published by Füsli in his "Beiträge." Immersion was also introduced by Grebel. Its first subject was Wolfgang Ulman of *St. Gall*, who insisted on being baptized in that mode, and was accordingly immersed by Grebel in the Rhine at *Schaffhausen*.<sup>4</sup> The sect had no separate order of ministers: every one who chose, might teach and administer baptism to those who desired it.<sup>5</sup>

Zwingli, anxious to reclaim them, appointed a weekly conference for amicable discussion; but after the second meeting they declined any farther attendance. At the outset they were distinguished by a strictly moral and religious deportment, avoiding vicious associations, and bearing a loud and impressive testimony against every form of sinful pleasure. Their apparent rectitude and sanctity procured for them much favor with the people. Many were induced to receive their doctrines and their baptism; and among these were respectable citizens and ministers of the gospel in good standing. But their enthusiasm grew with their

<sup>1</sup> Gieseler's *Lehrb. der Kirch. gesch.* vol. 2 p. 210, note 60.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Füsli, &c., vol. 2 p. 338, &c.

<sup>4</sup> Hottinger, &c., p. 265.

<sup>5</sup> Füsli, &c., vol. 1, p. 270, note 57.



success, and quickly degenerated into a ridiculous and frantic fanaticism. They were particularly numerous in the parish of *Zollikon*, the pastor of which was a certain John Brödl, a ranting extravagant. From this place a raving crowd rushed into the capital, being covered with sacks, in imitation of the ancient prophets, and girt about their loins with cords or withs, professing to be urged by the divine spirit. They filled all the public places with their prophesying, denouncing Zwingli as the old dragon, and his associates as the dragon's heads, preaching righteousness and innocence, urging the community of goods, and holding forth the judgments of God to those who would not obey. They perambulated the streets of the city crying wo—wo—wo to Zurich! and some of them, imitating the prophet Jonah, declared that in forty days *Zurich* would be destroyed!

Great excitement and confusion arose in the city; the multitudes were alarmed, and the rulers perplexed, and none could tell where the disorder would end. The preachers of the reformation were indefatigable; but, so far as the fanatics were concerned, their exertions were unavailing; their reasonings appeared to them as the errors of unenlightened minds or the suggestions of the devil. The infatuated crowd were satisfied as to themselves that they were actuated by divine inspiration, imputed their wildest freaks to the spirit of God, and every thing that crossed them to the devil.

Such men were not to be reasoned with: confinement and a rod seemed to their co-temporaries better adapted to cure their madness than argument. They were, nevertheless, treated by the government, in the beginning, with tenderness and forbearance; comparatively mild measures only being pursued to repress the disorder and to reclaim the wrong-headed errorists. A public discussion on the subject of baptism, in the presence of the councils, was appointed, in order that the truth on the matter in question might be demonstrated to every one's satisfaction. The seventeenth of January was appointed for that purpose. The meeting took place, and Grebel, Mantz, and William Roubli, formerly pastor of the parish of *Wytikon*, defended the cause of the Anabaptists against the reformers. The result was a complete discomfiture of the sectaries. Their doctrine was thereupon declared to be erroneous, and the leaders were admonished to renounce their errors, and to submit to the authority of the word of God as already expounded. On the following day the

<sup>1</sup> Gieseler, &c., vol. 3, p. 210, note—Füßlin, &c., vol. 1, p. 198, note 37.

government published a mandate, ordering that all those who had withholden their children from baptism, by reason of the erroneous opinion which had recently arisen, should cause them to be baptized within eight days, and such as refused obedience should depart with their families and goods from the city and the canton.<sup>1</sup> These measures proved wholly ineffectual: the leaders of the sect said: "We must obey God rather than men," and, in despite of the government, not only continued their previous course, but resolved to organize their followers into a separate Church. Their determination was first carried into effect in the parish of *Zollikon*, where they sought to realize their visionary theories, and established in their community of saints a community of goods, and, if Hottinger be not mistaken, a community of wives!<sup>2</sup>

Such an act of schism, so contrary to the spirit of the age, and characterized as it was by contumacy and bold defiance, was more than the age could tamely bear. But it gave unity and strength to the sect, while it nourished their zeal and fed their extravagance. As the evil grew continually, and the sectaries alledged that they were sustained by the authority of God, the government appointed another public discussion to take place on the 20th of March. It was held accordingly; and as the champions of the schismatic party only repeated their former arguments, which, in the judgment of the council, the reformers had already refuted, they were now told that they must retrace their steps, and abandon their new organization, or suffer the penalty of disobedience. They refused to obey; in consequence of which some of them, and of their disciples, were arrested: foreigners were sent into banishment, citizens who promised submission were set at liberty, but the obstinate were detained in prison; which we may suppose to have been a prudent precaution against further agitation in the excited state of the public mind. But a number of these prisoners broke from their confinement and escaped, and going abroad proclaimed wherever they came that God had sent an angel who had delivered them, as he once did St. Peter, from their imprisonment! Their story, asserted with boldness, was believed by the ignorant, and drew numbers to their party; and the evil was thus rendered worse by the measure that was intended to be its remedy.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See the document in Füsli, &c., vol. 1, p. 189-201.

<sup>2</sup> Hottinger, &c., p. 223.

<sup>3</sup> Hottinger, &c., p. 264. Füsli, &c., vol. 1, p. 249, note 52.

Brödli and Roubli being driven from *Zollikon*, went to *Schaffhausen*, and thence to *Waldshut*, where they rebaptized the converts. Hubmeyer, hitherto hesitating, and lingering in the ancient customs, was borne away by the current of their enthusiasm, and received baptism at the hand of Roubli, and with him above a hundred other persons; and so rapid was now the progress of the sect, that, at the Easter festival, Hubmeyer administered baptism to about three hundred converts.<sup>1</sup>

Many of those who were set at liberty upon a promise of submission, resumed their former course on returning to their brethren. The disturbance increased, and, in addition to the former mischief, the ringleaders were now charged with entertaining designs against the government and the existing order of things. They tampered, it was said, with the discontented peasantry, who were encouraged to hope for a deliverance from their burdens, and a community of goods; they talked of striking off the heads of priests, and of resisting the civil authorities by force of arms; they said that Christians had no need of earthly rulers and courts of justice, and that no Christian could be a member of the secular government. These seditious principles, so well adapted to nourish insubordination, spread a general ferment among the peasantry, in some instances produced actual risings, and in not a few caused assemblies of the people, and applications to the councils for a release from their burdens. The dissatisfaction was greatest with regard to the payment of tithes, which was represented as an arbitrary imposition, unauthorized by the Scriptures, and unsupported by any principle of equity. This question was, therefore, argued by order of the council, in their presence, by the most learned among the preachers and the citizens, and the result of the argument was that the tithing-system ought not to be abolished. The ground taken by Zwingli and approved by the council was not the authority of the Levitical law, which, he maintained, was a part of the Mosaic dispensation, and expired with it by its own limitation, but the fact that the lands came into the possession of the present holders subject to the payment of tithes, and this condition, therefore, formed a part of the contract, which could not be changed or annulled without the consent of the receivers: or they were conveyed to trustees by benevolent donors for the benefit of religion and education, or the relief of the poor, and therefore could not be turned from that destination, nor freed from the tax which

<sup>1</sup> Füsli, &c., vol. 3, p. 241.

it imposed upon them: and, moreover, if the tithing-system were abolished, there would be a necessity of imposing the same burdens in another form for the same objects. On these grounds the council dismissed the petitions, and issued their mandate commanding the payment of tithes, and warning the disaffected of the consequences of disobedience.

The Anabaptists, nevertheless, continued their offensive proceedings, fomenting discontent, and treating the orders of government with contemptuous neglect. Numbers of them were therefore imprisoned; and many of these, having been formerly liberated on a promise of amendment, were now treated with greater severity. These arrests furnished new matter of complaint and of mutual encouragement to the sect, who looked upon this treatment as a persecution for righteousness' sake that entitled them to the kingdom of heaven. They raised the outcry, that the government were bent upon executing their pleasure by force and violence, and condemned the innocent unheard; they clamored for a hearing, and demanded that Zwingli should not be suffered to browbeat their speakers, as they alledged he had done.<sup>1</sup> These complaints awakened sympathy in their behalf and gave new popularity to their cause. The government were therefore necessitated to yield, notwithstanding their reluctance, to what they esteemed an unreasonable demand after the previous conferences, and to grant a third disputation, which they appointed on the 6th of November, 1525. To remove every ground of complaint, and to place the malcontents fully in the wrong before the community, they extended the invitation to all Anabaptists both of their own and of other territories, and gave liberty to every one to plead his cause as he thought best without interruption; and as the district of *Grüningen* was particularly favorable to the sect, they caused a deputation of twelve men to be sent from that district at the public expense, that they might witness all the transactions of the meeting and attest them to their fellow-citizens at home. The assembly was very large, and the discussions were continued throughout three days. Its result was like that of the two preceding conferences: the leaders of the sect were adjudged to have failed in sustaining their cause on scriptural grounds; Grebel, Mantz, Blaurock, and others, were admonished to desist from propagating doctrines which they were unable to prove; and continuing obstinate, they were at first imprisoned, but were soon released, in the hope of their

<sup>1</sup> Füsliu, &c., vol. 1, p. 279-286 and notes.



amendment, and dismissed with an assurance of punishment if they continued their disorderly proceedings.<sup>1</sup> The result of the conference was announced in a public edict, the authors of anabaptism were severely reprobated, rebaptism was forbidden and punishment threatened to the disobedient, and parents were commanded to have their children baptized.<sup>2</sup> The government at the same time addressed a written communication to the people of *Grüningen*, in which, after commenting upon the history of the Anabaptists and their recent discomfiture in the last disputation, and declaring their determination to root out so pernicious a sect, they demanded a speedy answer to the question whether they would take part with the government or with the Anabaptists. The inhabitants of the district were thereupon convened, and after hearing the statement of the twelve who had witnessed the transactions of the late conference, determined to take part with their legitimate sovereigns against the sectaries.<sup>3</sup> But the Anabaptists who were numerous in the district had influence enough afterwards to withdraw them again from their allegiance.<sup>4</sup> As these measures also proved ineffectual, and the fanatical leaders persisted in their course, disregarding every mandate, and acting in defiance of the constituted authorities, the government proceeded ultimately to the last resort, and, in March 1526, published an edict which made the act of rebaptizing a capital offence, and subjected the guilty to the punishment of death by drowning. In November of the same year another edict followed, which was based upon information which the government had received, "That some, in the lordship of *Grüningen* and elsewhere, were holding large conventions, and in the same were transacting, plotting, and contriving measures that were hostile to government, and to the common cause of christianity;" and it extended the penalty of the preceding act "to all who thus combined, and by their preaching in conventicles, and their wrong proceedings, held such assemblies."<sup>5</sup>

The first who suffered under these edicts was Felix Mantz, who was drowned at *Zurich*, January 5th, 1527. He bore his fate with the utmost fortitude. On his way to the place of execution, he thanked God that he was about to suffer death for his truth, and remarked that Christ had predicted that his disciples would suffer for his name's sake and for the truth. He contin-

<sup>1</sup> Ibid, p. 284, note 58.—Hottinger, &c., 271.

<sup>2</sup> Füsli, &c., vol. 1, p. 285, note 58.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid, p. 270, note 57.

<sup>4</sup> Hottinger, &c., p. 271.

<sup>5</sup> Hottinger, &c., p. 271.



ed to speak in the same strain, and when the preacher who accompanied him attempted to converse with him, his mother and his brother exhorted him to constancy and firmness. As he fell bound into the water, he exclaimed: "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit." His brother wept, but his aged mother shed no tear.<sup>1</sup>

These harsh measures so far repressed the activity of the sect, that they withdrew from public observation, and held their meetings and propagated their doctrines in secret. But they were not suppressed, and the heroic endurance of death by many of their brethren shed a lustre upon their cause, and furnished materials for a history of martyrs, often embellished with tales of miraculous attestations from heaven, that did them important service, and compensated in a good measure for the severities which they suffered.

From *Zurich* and *Waldshut* this dangerous sect quickly overspread the neighboring countries of *Switzerland* and *Germany*, wherever they were not crushed at once by committing them to the sword or the flames. They were every-where treated by the civil power with more or less severity, especially in Popish countries, where great numbers were put to death, and many of them died at the stake, among whom were *Blaurock* and *Hubmeyer*. The cities of *Basel*, *Bern*, *St. Gall*, and *Coire* issued edicts similar to those of *Zurich*. The Imperial chamber of *Spire*, in the German empire, promulgated a decree by which they ordained, "That all and every re-baptizer and re-baptized person, whether male or female, of adult age, should be put to death by fire and sword, or by other means, according to the circumstances of the person, without a previous inquisition of the spiritual courts; and those peace-breakers, ringleaders, vagrants, and seditious instigators of the vice of re-baptism, if they persist therein, or relapse into it, should by no means find favor, but should be proceeded against with rigor according to the statute. Such, however, as confessed their error and recalled it, and were willing to submit to penance for it, and supplicated for mercy, might be pardoned, in consideration of their condition, business, youth, and all the circumstances. Every one also should have his children baptized agreeably to christian order, custom and usage. But whoever should contemptuously omit to do so, esteeming infant-baptism a nullity, shall be considered an Anabaptist, and subjected to the above ordinance."<sup>2</sup> This example was follow-

<sup>1</sup> Füsli, vol. 1, p. 274, note 57. Hottinger p. 385.

<sup>2</sup> Füsli, &c., vol. 1, p. 272, note 57.

ed by the emperor CHARLES V., and the several princes of the empire, who expelled the miserable sect from their dominions, not by argument, but by the sword. Their blood was freely shed : and when they were not put to death, they were otherwise punished with fines, imprisonment, stripes, or banishment.<sup>1</sup>

It may be truly said that this was a cruel persecution, and particularly ill became Protestants who contended so earnestly for the rights of conscience. But it was not without its apology, both in the spirit of the age and in the principles and the conduct of the sufferers. It was not easy for men just emerging from the darkness of Popery to open their eyes at once upon the light in the fulness of its blaze, and to see the falsity and the wickedness of the principle so long held and granted, *That errors in religion, obstinately persisted in, were crimes which christian rulers ought to punish.* The Anabaptists themselves also furnished sufficient cause to identify them with Munzer and the revolted peasantry, whose enormities had kindled a feeling of extreme bitterness in the minds of the secular rulers. Their tenet, *That among christians there should be no secular government, and that no christian could hold such an office,* was leveled against all existing governments : it implied that every secular ruler was an infidel, and, as such, unworthy to preside over a christian people ; and the dissemination of such a doctrine among the multitude could not fail to be of injurious effect. The odium which this tenet every-where brought upon them, and the vengeance which it armed against them, at length opened their eyes, and taught them to purge it from their creed. To the church they were not less offensive by their fanatical excesses, and their scurrilous denunciation of institutions which all the christian world revered as holy and divine. They reviled, in the most indecent terms, the existing churches and their ministry, and denounced infant-baptism as an invention of the devil, and a useless ceremony, comparing it with the washing of a dog or other beast. It was not in the spirit of the times to tolerate such profane railing ; and it is not to be wondered at if those whom they thus angered sometimes treated them worse than they deserved.

To the Reformed Church the rise of this sect was particularly fraught with danger. The light of truth had but recently been brought again from its long concealment, and was still in doubtful conflict with darkness. Some of the Popish abuses had been

<sup>1</sup> Füsli, &c., vol. 1, p. 273.

abolished, and the way was cautiously preparing for the removal of the rest. The christian world was anxiously expecting the result. Enemies without assailed the nascent reformation, one while with alluring promises, and another with threats; whilst enemies within were looking out for coming events, eager to lay hold of any thing wherewith to crush it in its birth. The whole ground upon which the reformers stood was the principle, *That the Bible is the sufficient and only rule of faith and practice, and for the right understanding of it we need no other than its own light.* In the midst of the conflict the Anabaptists arose like a whirlwind; they pronounced the doctrine of the reformers false and their church an abomination, and professed to teach the true gospel and to form the only true church. The Papists took advantage of this schism to invalidate the fundamental principle of the reformation, to prove the inutility of the Bible as the rule of faith, and to show the necessity of a supreme judge of controversies. The Reformed were thus placed between two hostile forces on opposite sides, and seemed devoted to perdition amid the assaults of both: and to a power and a wisdom far above her own is it owing that the Reformed Church came unhurt out of these dangers.

The necessity was now imposed upon the reformers to shew that, though the Bible was sufficiently clear, their adversaries gave a false representation of its meaning, and that the doctrine which it teaches was that which they themselves had taught. Hence were the repeated public discussions of which the Bible was made the basis, and hence the writings of the reformers on this subject.

The first of Zwingli's works in this controversy was published May 27, 1525, under the title: "Of Baptism, Re-baptism, and Infant-baptism." It was dedicated to the council and citizens of *St. Gall*, where the sect were become very numerous. His second work: On the Gospel-Ministry, "with an introductory address to his countrymen of the county of *Tokkenburg*, appeared on the 30th of June. In reply to Hubmeyer, who had put forth a slanderous attack upon his character, he published, in November of the same year, his vindication entitled: On Doctor Balthazar's Tract on Baptism: a true and solid Answer," which contained the argument he employed at the same time in the third public disputation. Another work: "Against the Craft and Artifices of the Anabaptists," appeared in 1527.

Anabaptists have charged Zwingli with instigating the government to the harsh measures that were adopted against them. Hubmeyer was the first, or among the first, who urged this serious

charge. In the dedication prefixed to his published account of his conference at *Nicolsburg* in 1526, which may serve as a specimen of his calumnies, he says: "They wished to convert me to another faith by the executioner, agreeably to Zwingli's sentence pronounced publicly in the pulpit upon me and many other pious persons—men, women and maidens; that we as Anabaptists, ought to have our heads cut off conformably to the imperial laws. This is his gospel, word of consolation, and work of mercy, with which he comforted and visited the christians in prison. Yea, he preached a very singular sermon—and finally too brought it to this, that above twenty persons, men, women, pregnant wives, and maidens, were miserably cast into gloomy towers, and doomed no more to see the light of the sun or moon, to end their days on bread and water, and thus to remain together in the dark towers, the living and the dead, to die, stink, and putrify, till none survived.—Oh God, what an unheard of, grievous, and rigid sentence upon pious christian people, against whom no ill could be truly said, save only that, in obedience to the strict command of Christ, they had received water-baptism."<sup>1</sup>

That this is a grossly exaggerated and false account of the treatment of the Anabaptist prisoners in *Zurich*, is satisfactorily shown by Füsli in his "Beiträge."<sup>2</sup> But our purpose here is only to vindicate the innocence of Zwingli of a charge so inconsistent with his avowed principles, and so discreditable to his character. "There is not a shadow of truth," says Füsli in the same place, "in the assertion that Zwingli incited the government to such harsh proceedings. He manifests no little meekness and patience toward them in his first writings. In the dedication of his book "On Baptism, &c," he says: 'I will utter no hard and bitter speeches against them, although I know that they vilify and calumniate me above measure. They assert that I am the cause of their banishment from the city and the country by the council, and of their being in exile; but I can appeal to themselves, that, in their presence, I entreated the council not to adopt rigorous measures against them. At the same time I advised several counsellors in private, that a better course would be to tolerate them in the territory of *Zurich*, than to send them elsewhere; inasmuch as it was well known here to every one, that they have been vanquished in argument on all occasions, and an enemy who is known to be conquered excites no fear. This is my offence; this is the great injury they have received from me. I have always been grieved for their ill and hardship.

<sup>1</sup> Füsli, vol. 1, p. 206.<sup>2</sup> Ibid, p. 207, &c.



—I have always kindly entreated them to desist from their obstinacy. If they would acknowledge the truth, they would not deny this. From this every pious christian may judge, who has acted more honestly and christian-like.” “In another writing,” continues the same author, “addressed to Conrad Som, preacher and reformer in *Ulm*, he states that, as often as he appeared with the Anabaptists before the council, he had entreated for them, and had thereby obtained that the council proceeded so slowly against them. On another occasion he exercised the same kindness toward them. When one of the exiled ringleaders had published a scurrilous libel on the government of *Zurich*, he took the utmost pains to suppress the defamatory production, lest it should come to the knowledge of the council, and that body should be provoked to resort to more rigorous measures. When, some time afterward, Faber reproached him, in one of his writings, with having caused the poor Anabaptists, as he called them, to be imprisoned and badly used, he complained with much feeling of the injustice of the accusation, and asked: What, I pray, do the calumniators think of the council of *Zurich*? Do they consider them so witless, that they would, on all occasions, ask council of me? Am I the council’s master, that I can prescribe to them what they shall do?” “Finally,” says Füsli still, “what reason had Hubmeyer to complain of him? He had generously saved him from those who had sought his life, and persuaded the council to let him go in peace when they might justly have punished him for his wickedness, and even obtained for him a considerable sum of money to bear his travelling expenses. ‘The council,’ says Zwingli, in a letter to Gynoräus, ‘did not force him to this recantation, if he were willing to leave the city; for they did nothing more to those who would not repudiate Anabaptism than to banish them. In the mean time the Imperial ambassadors arrived and demanded him, that he might be brought to condign punishment. This was refused in pursuance of a law which provides, that a citizen should be tried only for the crime for which he was at first arrested. In this manner the council sinned by him, viewing him as a citizen, and evading the emperor’s demand. \* \* He wrote a recantation accordingly with his own hand, which was not copied from any form prescribed by the council, or by any other person; and when he had read it in the church of Notre Dame, he retracted it after I had preached, and, thinking he now had an occasion to speak, said many things against infant-baptism and for re-baptism. \* \* \* Upon this he was re-conducted to prison, and kept more than a month in confine-



ment. At length he wished to exculpate himself, saying, he had no recollection of doing any thing amiss : if he had spoken otherwise than he had promised, it was the evil spirit that had sported with him. He then wrote another recantation. I went every where to my friends, exhorting them to exercise mercy toward him, and to admit him to a hearing by the council. This was done. When he now offered his recantation of his own accord, they required that he should write it in German, and presently afterward leave the country. I now went immediately to my colleagues, Engelhard, Leo, and Grossman, and besought them to intercede for him, because, if he were compelled to depart immediately after his recantation, he would be exposed to great danger both from confederates and from the emperor. The council yielded, and after his recantation, which he uttered with apparent sincerity, though it was any thing else rather, permitted him to remain concealed in Zurich, until he might depart in safety. Sometime afterward a citizen, who is sincerely attached to the gospel, conveyed him away so privately, that even the citizens knew nothing of it."<sup>1</sup>

Füslin observes in his note : " It does not appear from the records that no ill could be said of the sect, save only that they were re-baptized. Re-baptism would not have amounted to much, if it had not served to add strength to other errors. Their separation from the Church ; their disobedience and hostility to government, their suspicious intercourse with the discontented subjects who wished to rid themselves of tithes, rents, and other obligations, and were encouraged in this by their teaching ; their doctrine of matrimony, which obliged a believer, that is, an Anabaptist, to separate from his or her consort who was not of the same faith ; these were the causes that chiefly armed the government against them."<sup>2</sup> It must be confessed, however, that the law made the fact of being re-baptized, or of conferring the rite on another person, the evidence of a participation in the crimes that were charged upon the sect ;<sup>3</sup> and it cannot be denied, as Füslin himself observes, that their treatment proceeded ultimately pretty much upon Popish principles of religious coercion.<sup>4</sup> Religious intolerance was the great vice of the age ; a vice which the church of *Rome* had nursed and cherished into maturity ; which she had raised by her constant practice, and by her solemn decrees, to the honors of the holiest virtue : and it is not to be

<sup>1</sup> Füslin vol. 1, p. 212, note 40.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid, p. 211.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid, p. 210, note k.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid, p. 196, note 37.

greatly wondered at, if those who had grown up within her pale continued to be fettered by it long after they had left her communion. Zwingli, nevertheless, had not so learned Christ: both he and Luther were, in this respect, far in advance of the age in which they lived.

The Anabaptists did not all adopt all the errors of their brethren; and it would be unjust to say that there were not among them many examples of sincere piety, though blended more or less with fanaticism. Neither did all their brethren who fell into gross excess adopt the same errors and practice the same fooleries. Mantz taught, it is said, that baptism extinguished all sinful propensities, and the baptized were, therefore, without sin. Others held that those who transgress after baptism commit the sin against the Holy Ghost. Others again, who indulged freely in sinful pleasures, thought that, as they were not in the flesh but in the spirit, such things could not affect them. Lewis Henger and his followers rejected the atonement and the divinity of Christ. John Denk and his party taught the ultimate salvation of the damned. Some rejected the Old Testament as of no use to Christians. Some repudiated the whole of the written word as a dead letter that killeth, professing to be taught by the Spirit, the internal word. In their meetings for worship some of them fell suddenly upon the floor, or rubbed their backs against the wall, bent their hands and fingers as in convulsions, distorted their faces, and wrought themselves into profuse sweats. This they called "dying with Christ." When they recovered themselves, they spoke of sublime heavenly things; and this they called "testifying." Some, who, it was alledged, could neither read nor write, spoke occasionally from the Holy Scripture; and what they said was taken down in writing by others, and esteemed a word of God.<sup>1</sup> A tragic event, which occurred on the Müllegg, in the precincts of *St. Gall*, furnished a painful illustration of the nature of the spirit that actuated these enthusiasts, and of the pernicious tendency of a blind confidence in imagined supernatural illuminations, irrespective of reason and the written word of God. N. Shugger, a venerable sire of eighty years, and his five sons, had embraced the doctrine of the Anabaptists. On a Shrove-Tuesday, being the seventh of February, 1526, a large number of the brethren were assembled at his house to celebrate the festival, and were entertained by a feast on a fatted calf by the aged father. The time was spent in various fanatical exer-

<sup>1</sup> Hottinger, &c., p. 268, &c.

cises, and two of the sons; Leonard and Thomas, fancying themselves under powerful divine influences, raved like madmen. In the midst of their phrensy, the former cried out to his brother: Thomas, It is the will of the heavenly Father that you strike off my head! After some frantic fooleries, Thomas exclaimed: Father, thy will be done! He directed his brother to kneel, and, in the presence of the whole assembly, took a sword and struck off his head as he knelt before them. After thanking God that he had overcome, he ran to the house of Vadianus, the burgo-master, in *St. Gall*, and said to him: He will do it no more: I have given it to him. The burgo-master, thinking him deranged, commanded him to be led into the house, but learning very soon the facts of the dreadful tragedy, sent him to prison. In his confinement the miserable man continued to ascribe the horrid deed to the agency of God, acknowledging that he had done it, but maintaining that God had wrought it by him. Three successive trials on the rack could elicit nothing else from him, and he died under the hand of the executioner still affirming the same thing.<sup>1</sup>

H. Bullinger, in his history of the Anabaptists, gives the following account of their doctrine.

"They esteem themselves the only true and acceptable church and congregation of Christ, and teach that those, who are received into their society by baptism, must have no communion whatever, either with the evangelical, or with any other church: for our churches are not truer churches of Christ than the Papists or others. They urge in proof of this, that in their churches there is evident reformation of life, whereas in the so-called evangelical churches nobody reforms: all are impenitent, captivated in sins and vices; for which reason it is unbecoming to have fellowship with them."

"There is also a defect in the ministers as well as in the people, both as to their persons and as to their ministry. As to their persons, because they are not rightly called; because they possess not the qualifications described by St. Paul in 1 Tim. 3.; because they do not themselves practice what they teach others; and because they accept salaries and benefices." \* \* \* \* \*

"There is farther a great defect in their ministry, both as to their teaching and as to their administration of sacraments. As to their teaching, because all are bound to the preaching of one man, although Paul ordained that, if a revelation come to one who sitteth, the first shall be silent, that the other may speak."

<sup>1</sup> Hottinger p. 289.

"The preachers do not abide by the word alone, but expound the Scripture, although the Scripture is not to be interpreted according to every one's exposition."

"The sermons of the preachers are too insignificant; for they teach that Christ has made satisfaction for sin, and that man is justified by faith and not by works; although, in this wicked world, nothing should be more insisted on than good works."

"So also the preachers have taught that it is impossible that a man should keep the law; although the whole Scripture commands the keeping of the law."

"The preachers do not teach aright concerning love, agreeably to which all things should be held in common; for they pretend that a Christian may possess property and be rich, whereas love would rather have all things common among the brethren."

"The preachers mingle together the Old Testament and the New; although the Old Testament is abrogated and of no validity with Christians, and those of the Old Testament, moreover, have no kindred with those of the New."

"What the preachers say of souls, that they pass directly to heaven after the death of the body, is not certain; for they sleep until the day of judgment."

"The preachers grant too much to government, of which Christians have no need, inasmuch as they are wholly passive. A Christian cannot be a secular magistrate."

"Government neither shall nor may take cognizance of religion and matters of faith."

"Christians do not resist violence: therefore they have no need of courts. Neither does a Christian use a court."

"Christians put no man to death. They do not punish with the prison and the sword, but with the ban only."

"Nobody must be compelled to believe by any force or constraint: neither must any one be put to death on account of his belief."

"Christians make no resistance: therefore they wage no war, and in this do not obey government."

"The speech of Christians is yea, yea; nay, nay. They swear not at all: wherefore also they swear no oath: swearing an oath would be sin and wrong."

"The ministry of the preachers is further defective in the administration of the sacraments; because they baptize infants: for infant-baptism is from the pope and out of the devil."

"Re-baptism, on the contrary, is the true Christian baptism, being given unto repentance to those who make a profession, and are instructed, and have understanding."



"The preachers make no distinction, and do not drive sinners from the Lord's supper, and use no ban."

"For all these, and for other similar reasons, the Anabaptists must, as they say, separate themselves from us, and cannot remain with us, unless they would become partakers of our pollution and punishment. Wherefore their own salvation, and their safety from divine wrath, and, consequently, the highest necessity, constrain them to form their own separate Church, and to endure, on that account, whatever God may give them to suffer."

There is in this form of doctrine a singular mixture of truth and error. Their fine sentiments on religious liberty would possess more value, if the Anabaptists, instead of being the sufferers, had been in a condition to prescribe terms to the rest of the christian world, and if they had not themselves talked of cutting off the heads of priests. Every sect has asserted the same just principles in its distress, and has forgotten them in its prosperity.

It may be questioned whether the Anabaptists would have adopted their odious opinions on the subject of civil government, if they had been left to indulge their religious opinions and to form their separate organization unmolested. Some of them, at least, professed a willingness to obey the civil authorities, if they did not interfere with their religious convictions. But when the government stood in their way where they thought their duty called them, there was an easy step to the thought, that the government was wicked, an enemy of God, and ought to be abolished. Hostility to secular rulers was, however, a primary principle with Munzer.

---

#### NOEL ON BAPTISM.

*Essay on Christian Baptism. By Baptist W. Noel, M. A.*  
New York: Harper & Brothers; 1850. Pp. 308, 12 mo.

It is generally admitted, we believe, that this work is of no special weight for the controversy in whose service it appears. It presents nothing new, and it repeats but little of the old in any better form than it carried before. The work of a truth is emphatically lean and superficial. Still the highly respectable source from which it proceeds, and the widely public character

\* Füsliä vol. 5, p. 131, &c.



of the occasion to which it owes its production, entitle it to something more than common consideration; and altogether it may be taken as a very fit and fair opportunity for bringing to trial, in a general way, the theological and religious merits of the popular system to whose defence and recommendation it is so zealously devoted.

We call the system *popular*, with due thought and consideration. Its friends, we know, are fond of harping occasionally on the opposite idea; as though it needed more than common fortitude and resolution to fall in with the Baptist theory, in contradiction to the old catholic faith. Mr. Noel evidently looks upon himself as something of a martyr, in the way of sacrifice and self-renunciation, for following his convictions into the bosom of his new communion, as much so as for following them in the first place out of the bosom of the Establishment; and he is prone continually to resolve the backwardness of others to acknowledge what he holds to be the plain sense of the Scriptures, into the moral cowardice that shrinks from the thought of losing caste, or suffering damage in some outward view, for the sake of an unfashionable and unpopular cause. But it is only in one view, that the system of the Baptists is found to be thus unpopular. It goes against antiquity and the authority of the universal Church; and in these circumstances it is hard not to feel, that it involves some loss of privilege, and some serious spiritual hazard, which men should not be willing lightly to incur. This however is only the same sort of prejudice which is found to hold, in christian lands, against other forms of religious profession which are regarded as still more broadly opposed to the ancient faith; Unitarianism for instance or Universalism; which at the same time are but seldom allowed to carry with them any presumption of truth and righteousness on such account. It requires generally still more nerve in this view, to become a convert to Unitarianism, than it does to espouse the cause of the Baptists. In neither case have we any right to infer from the difficulty any such contrariety to the natural mind of the world, as may be taken for the criterion of divine truth. On the contrary, it requires no very profound examination to see that the system held in both cases falls in strikingly with what may be termed the natural mind of the world, and in such view is exactly suited to gain popularity and credit. The Baptist theory excludes mystery, and turns religion into a thing of measurable intelligence and common sense. It falls in thus with the tendency of Protestantism to assert the rights of the individual subject in religion, over against the claims of objective authority; a

tendency which *ought* to be asserted within right limits; while it is particularly liable also, for this very reason, to be carried to an extreme, destructive entirely of what belongs to the opposite interest. It is not to be denied, that such extreme subjectivity or individualism has come to form the reigning character of Protestant Christianity at the present time; and especially may this be said to be the case in our own country, the land of universal toleration and freedom, where the very idea of the Church is in danger of being swallowed up and lost in the distraction of sects as the only true and proper form of the christian life. With this reigning spirit, the Baptist view of religion stands unquestionably in very close correspondence and affinity. However it may have been persecuted in the beginning, under the mild theocracy of New England, it has long since ceased to be the faith of suffering exiles and martyrs. It has grown into a large world of christian profession, covering the length and breadth of the entire land. This is held together by no bond of unity indeed in other respects; for it belongs to its very nature to be as much as possible unchurchly and inorganic, a mere multitude of men and women following the Bible severally to suit themselves. But taking them simply as *Baptists*, sticklers for immersion and excommunicators of infants from Christ, they form collectively the most numerous religious body in the United States. They have the art of making proselytes, beyond almost all other people. The sect spirit, as it prevails in all parts of the land, has a wonderful propensity towards the Baptist system; for it is constitutionally unsacramental and rationalistic, and is always inclined to resolve religion into the thinking and working of man, to the exclusion of its mystical power as it lies on the side of God. Hence new sects are apt to take Anabaptist ground; especially where they have their origin, not immediately in some doctrinal interest, but in zeal rather for religious experience. It is but too plain thus that the Baptists have a strong popular feeling on their side, which needs only to be set free still farther from the force of mere outward authority, standing in tradition and custom, to bring the world generally to espouse their cause.

This favorable state of the public mind in regard to the theory of the Baptists is not to be measured simply by their actual discipleship, or the preparation there may be in different quarters to receive in form their particular system; it shows itself also to a large extent in the indifference and want of faith, with which the contrary system is too generally maintained. It is of small account to oppose a system, if the principle of it, that from which it draws its life and strength, be the meanwhile silently allowed

and approved. Opposition, in such case, may be kept up as a sort of outside fashion; but it will carry with it no real earnestness or power. It is in truth no better than treason at last to the cause it pretends to uphold. Of such character necessarily are all argument and practice against the Baptists, which do not rest truly on the old idea of the Church and its sacraments, but start from the premises of the Baptists themselves with regard to the nature of religion, virtually surrendering in this way the whole interest in debate. Very much of our existing fidelity to the old church practice, it is to be feared, labors under this grievous defect. It is a matter of outward form and ceremony, more than of true inward faith and conviction. It makes common cause with the general scheme of the Baptists in regard to religion and the Church, and is obedient only to its own tradition in refusing to carry out this scheme to the same consequences. In these circumstances, no great account is made of the variation in which the system stands from the proper church practice. So far as it may be considered wrong, it is still viewed with the utmost indulgence and forbearance; the difference is taken to regard a mere circumstance in religion, without reaching at all to its main substance; and the only cause for regret and complaint in regard to it is, that the Baptists themselves should be disposed to lay so much stress upon it, as they generally do, in the way of uncharitable exclusiveness towards others. Mr. Noel's transition to their ranks is taken indeed for a mark of some weakness and eccentricity; but it is still not allowed to qualify materially, in this view, the vast merit which all non-episcopal bodies are expected, as a matter of course, to see in his previous abandonment of the English Establishment. It is but too plain from the way in which the subject is frequently noticed, that for a large part of this interest among us, the acknowledgment of a churchly and sacramental religion is something altogether worse than the virtual renunciation of the sacraments as it holds among the Baptists. Noel the Baptist, to this system of thinking, is much more respectable and every way intelligible, than Noel the Episcopalian. The difference which has place in the first direction, is regarded as small and comparatively immaterial. The great matter is, that such a man has been able to leap the far more broad and serious chasm that yawns on the other side. Baptists and Paedobaptists, of the unchurchly stamp, have here common and like cause for gratulation. It is felt to be at last substantially one and the same gospel to which the illustrious convert has been won in either connection, and both unite accordingly in wishing him God-speed on his chosen way. For those who

consider it rightly, this is something very significant and instructive. It was not so always. The Baptist system, in the beginning, was held to be at war with Protestantism no less than with the faith of the ancient Church. Its deviation from the old church theory was felt to be something far more than a mere circumstance. How does it happen then that it should now be met with such easy toleration, as a thing of mere outward fashion and form? For the reason simply, beyond all doubt, that the view taken of the Church has undergone a material change. The sense of sacramental grace has to a wide extent passed away; and along with this, of course, the doctrine of infant baptism is to the same extent necessarily shorn of its proper meaning and force. The Baptist principle has come to prevail far and wide among those who are not Baptists; and in this way the opposition even which is made to their cause is found to be in truth too often but little better than a feint and a sham. The controversy is transferred to false and untenable ground, and so carries in itself the necessity of defeat from the beginning. It yields at the outset the main substance in dispute, and makes but a vain show of battle afterwards for its mere name and shadow. Here it is precisely that the Baptists of the present time have the greatest advantage. Their premises and principles are allowed extensively by the opposite side; and all that they need, in such circumstances, is to show that these principles and premises carry in them by necessary consequence the sense of their own system. Without faith in the Church, no consistent or effectual stand can ever be made against their pretensions.

The Baptist controversy, it is well known, falls mainly into two questions, the first regarding the *mode* of baptism and the second its proper *subjects*. The only valid mode, according to the Baptists, is by immersion. The only fit subjects, they tell us, are personal believers. Sprinkling they take to be of no force for the rite; and the application of it to infants they hold to be no better than a solemn farce.

It is truly unfortunate, in the case of the first of these questions, that the advocates of the present reigning practice have been led so commonly by polemical zeal to place themselves on extreme ground; furnishing thus in the end an advantage to their opponents, which they would not otherwise possess. When it is pretended to show immersion an abuse, and sprinkling the only legitimate mode of baptism, from the force of the original terms employed in the case, the general evidence of the New Testament, or the practice of the early Church, more is undertaken a great deal than can be accomplished, and more at



the same time in all respects than the argument properly requires; by which means harm only is done to the truth, and the cause of the opposite party made to seem far stronger than it is in fact. It needs but ordinary scholarship, and the freedom of a mind unpledged to mere party interest, to see and acknowledge here a certain advantage on the side of the Baptists. The original sense of the word *baptize* is on the whole in their favor. It corresponds with the idea of immersion much more than with that of sprinkling. This idea moreover undoubtedly lies at the bottom of the New Testament practice; although it would seem to be equally clear, for a candid inquirer, that this practice was not actually confined, under all circumstances, to the mode of immersion, in the literal and full sense. The allusion in Rom. vi. 4, and Col. ii. 12, to the form of going under the water and rising out of it again, as being at least the primary and fundamental character of the rite, is too plain to be misunderstood by any unsophisticated mind; and it is only a melancholy exemplification of the power which theological prejudice has over the best men, when otherwise able and faithful commentators of the anti-Baptist order are found vainly endeavoring, in modern times, to torture the passages into another meaning. The practice of the early Church too, as far back as we have any notices on the subject out of the New Testament, must be allowed to lie pre-vaillingly in favor of the same view. The most that can be said with regard to it, which however is a great deal over against the exclusive doctrine of the Baptists, is that the form of immersion was not considered indispensable to the validity of the sacrament. This is sufficiently shown by what is termed the *clinical baptism* of the ancient Church, aside from all other evidence. Clinical baptism was employed in the case of the sick, who were confined to bed or otherwise unfit to endure the rite of immersion. It consisted of a partial application of water, in the way of substitute for this, by a more or less plentiful affusion or aspersion. Persons thus baptized, if they afterwards recovered, were not considered eligible to any sacred office, as their profession might seem to have been forced upon them by sickness and so to be of doubtful sincerity; but no deficiency was held to attach to their baptism itself, and it was never felt necessary or proper accordingly to baptize them over again in a more full way. On this point, the testimony of Cyprian is well known and conclusive, showing at once the fact of such baptism by aspersion in the early Church, and the acknowledgment of its sufficiency, as resting on the view that the application of water, in the sacrament, is efficacious not according to surface and quan-



tity, as in common washing, but according to the accompanying grace of the Holy Ghost. "In sacramentis salutaribus, necessitate cogente et Deo indulgentiam suam largiente, *totum creditibus conferunt divina compendia.*" It is not to be disguised at the same time, however, that this allowance and apology for the validity of clinical baptism goes directly to show the general prevalence of baptism by immersion; and also the general feeling that it was regarded as the regular and proper mode, from which only in cases of urgent necessity it was considered lawful to depart. Cyprian's plea for it is worded with great caution and reserve, and treats it throughout as something in broad exception to the reigning practice. In the Oriental Church this practice has been preserved without change down to the present day; and the completeness of baptism is made to depend absolutely on its being performed by immersion, and not by any less universal application of water. In the Western or Latin Church a more free conception of the sacrament has prevailed; and from the thirteenth century particularly we find the practice of affusion or plentiful sprinkling gradually supplanting more and more generally the earlier method. The change seems to have grown to a considerable extent from the preponderance which the baptism of infants gained over that of adults, as the nations became generally christian, and the main use of the ordinance was transferred thus from heathen converts to the offspring of parents already in the Church. It was natural to extend the allowance of the so-called clinical baptism in favor especially of very young infants, who might be regarded as infirm by reason of their infancy itself, and so rightly entitled to the privilege; and this way of thinking, once introduced, appears to have worked in no great time a general revolution in the practice of the Church. The Reformation, in the sixteenth century, found the Roman Church generally, (with the exception of the Church of Milan which still adhered to the old form,) no longer in the exclusive use of immersion, but allowing also in place of it, when preferred, a partial application of water only, by affusion on the head or some other prominent part of the subject baptized. The symbolical sense of the application was held to be the main thing; and this was supposed to be as fully secured by its being poured upon the head, or shoulders, or breast, as though it were made to circumscribe in full the entire body. The force of the symbol was not measured by its outward quantity.

The Reformers were disposed to prefer the ancient custom; not from any superstitious regard to the mere letter of the institution; but out of respect for antiquity, and from the feeling also

of a certain congruity between the letter or form here and its proper inward sense. They questioned not the sufficiency of baptism by aspersion, but held the use of immersion to be on the whole more suitable and significant. Luther says, in a sermon on Baptism (Walch x, p. 2593): "Though it be the custom, in many places no longer to dip the children whole in the font, but only to pour water on them from it with the hand, it were better still and fit, according to the sense of the word *baptism*, that the child, or any one else who is baptized, should be entirely sunk into the water and drawn out again. \* \* This would suit the signification of the thing, and furnish a fully complete sign." Both of Luther's formularies for baptism, accordingly, that of 1523 and the revision of 1524, include the rubric: "Then let him take the child, and *dip it in the font*"—with clear reference to immersion. Calvin allows also indirectly a certain priority of worth to this mode, with full assertion at the same time of the proper freedom of Christianity in favor of the other practice. "Whether the whole person be immersed," he says, Inst. iv. 15, 19, "and this be once or thrice, or the water be merely poured on by aspersion, is of little account, and ought to be considered free to the churches according to their different regions. Though the word baptize does itself signify to *immerse*, and it is known that the rite of immersion prevailed also in the early Church." Several of the earlier Protestant church services call for dipping. In the first English Reformed Liturgy, a. 1547, a *trine immersion* of the child is prescribed, cases of infirmity only excepted; and it was not till the beginning of the 17th century that sprinkling gained the upper hand, for reasons of convenience and health. Gradually the usage of all the Protestant Churches settled down upon the same practice which had already begun to prevail in the Church of Rome; with the exception only of the Anabaptists; who however rested their view on a different theory altogether of the nature and force of the sacrament itself, and for this reason were not regarded as any part of the Church, either Catholic or Protestant.

The freedom exercised, in this case, by the Western Church generally, we hold to be in full harmony with the true idea of Christianity; as the want of it on the side of the Greek Church is an evidence of its having lost the proper life and spirit of its own original faith. It has been throughout the lively apprehension of the spiritual realness of the sacrament, as the presence actually and truly of an inward grace under an outward form, which has enabled the Church of the West, whether as Catholic or as Protestant, to make an ἀδελφότης of the mere circum-

stances of the symbol, while continuing to hold fast with becoming reverence and faith the substantial matter of the symbol itself. This is something far more than either a rationalistic rejection of the rite on the one hand, or a slavish adhesion to the outward letter of it on the other. These two extremes might seem to be sufficiently far apart, the one forming the exact contrary of the other. And yet it is not so in fact. They start from substantially the same false posture, in regard to the christian faith; and they come in the end to substantially the same result. Either may claim to be, and has often claimed to be in fact, not only Christianity, but this also under its highest and most perfect style. In one view thus we have the spiritualism of the Quaker; in another view the spiritualism of the Anabaptist. Their affinity is shown strikingly by their tendency to flow together at particular points, both in the earlier and later stages of their history. Both are constitutionally rationalistic, notwithstanding the high wrought temperature of their first life, or rather for this very reason one may say, and sooner or later this defect is found working itself into view with clear historical evidence and proof. Quakerism runs naturally into Hicksite infidelity, and Anabaptism just as naturally into lifeless mechanism and form, the corpse of religion deprived of its living soul. The common principle of both is the want of faith in the true and proper *mystery* of the sacraments. The Quaker places religion wholly in the sphere of thought, the naked spirit of the subject, and so will have nothing to do with the letter and sign. The Baptist places it there too, but makes a merit at the same time of honoring the letter and sign in a purely outward way, in token of his mental respect for the authority by which it is prescribed. In both cases, the grace and the sign are completely sundered. The Baptist turns the sacrament into a powerless ceremony as truly as the Quaker. Only he chooses to exercise *his* spirituality and rationalism, by squaring his practice in the case to the outward rule which God has been pleased to prescribe as the *test* of his pious obedience. In such view, of course, all turns on the letter; and the more precisely circumstantial this can be made, the more satisfactory it is taken to be as a trial of christian character. The Baptist, in this way, becomes a Jew.

A right appreciation here of the old church faith, as holding in a living way between these two abstractions, while it leads us to do justice to the free practice of the Western Church within proper limits, will prevent us at the same time from approving such freedom beyond these limits. It cannot be denied that there is a strong tendency with our later Protestantism, especially

under the Puritan form, to run the liberty of sprinkling, as it may be called, into actual licentiousness, by reducing the quantity of water used in baptism to the narrowest practicable measure. The force of the symbol does not indeed turn on the amount of the water employed; but something is still due to the reality and the original sense of the service in this view; and it is very certain that a true sacramental feeling must always operate, where it prevails, to produce a due regard to the mystical idea of the holy ordinance as joined with the water, which will not allow it to be stripped of its proper outward honor in the divine transaction. The old Church, in allowing a partial use of water, still required always that it should be in its measure plentiful and free. So also the Protestant Church of earlier times, in sanctioning the change from immersion to affusion. It marks no improvement on this in our own day, that the application is so frequently reduced to a few drops; the minister simply dipping his fingers in the water perhaps, and flinging some particles of what adheres to them into the child's face, instead of taking up as the old formularies prescribe at least his hand full of the element, and so pouring the same on its head. We have witnessed the service with pain performed in this style, where it was some relief to be sure that only a solitary drop reached the face of the infant, so utterly careless did the officiating priest show himself to be of anything more than the mere ceremony of going through the outward motions of the solemn rite. Now we know it is easy to say, that all depends on the Spirit, and that a single drop of water may be just as efficacious in his hands as all the rivers of Damascus, and Jordan along with them; but it is just as easy to go a single step farther also, and to affirm that the mere motion of the hand in imitation of the act of sprinkling would carry with it all the virtue and force of baptism, even if no water whatever were employed in the case. When it comes to this, of course, all faith in the sacrament as such is gone; the only religious reality owned in it is the *thought* of a certain spiritual work of which it is taken to be the emblem and sign; and it is hard to see why this might not be just as complete with the sign wanting altogether, according to the view of the Quaker. This disposition to rest in the merest minimum of the outward symbol, is something very different from the old sacramental faith, and may be taken always as the sure mark of its comparative if not total absence and failure. Hence it is, that it lends likewise powerful help always to the Baptist cause; not simply as it serves, like all ultraism, to bring reproach on the interest it affects to represent, but as it actually involves also the very spirit



itself by which this cause is actuated. It argues an unsacramental habit ; indifference or insensibility to the mystical import of the symbol employed in the transaction ; and where this prevails, the only proper alternative is, no water baptism at all or else slavish confinement to it, as a purely outward law, after the Baptist fashion.

In this case we have a double cause for regret. First, that the question of *mode* should be made to seem the main point at issue, and be so managed at the same time as to array the practice of sprinkling or affusion against immersion, as though the last must be shorn of all right in order to justify the other ; in consequence of which we have a great deal of false argument on this side, which only rebounds at last in favor of the opposite interest. Secondly, that the defence of sprinkling is too often based on so low a view of the sacrament as amounts well nigh to indifference itself, and thus in reality betrays the interest in whose service it appears. Any vindication of sprinkling which proceeds on the assumption that baptism in any shape is a mere ceremony, and that *therefore* no stress should be laid on the mode, must be regarded as a virtual surrendry of all that is material in the controversy, from the start.

The great question in truth however, in this Baptistie controversy, is that which relates to the proper subjects of the ordinance, and which is concerned particularly with the right of *infants* to be comprehended by means of it in the communion of the Christian Church. It is here, still more strikingly than in the other case, that we learn the distinctive character of this unchurchly system, and are brought to face in full at the same time the monstrous consequences to which it leads. Mr. Noel's book is occupied mainly with the lawfulness of infant baptism. He finds it a superstitious corruption, contrary to the Bible, contrary to reason, and contrary to primitive Christianity ; and only wonders that all sensible and sober men, in so plain a case, should not long since have come to look upon it in the same light.

Mr. Noel professes great reverence for the authority of the Scriptures. He has thrown himself, he tells us, entirely on their guidance ; carefully avoiding indeed all communication with Baptist writers, that his judgment might be formed in this way solely by divine teaching. He claims accordingly to be an original witness in the case, fresh from the fountain of all truth in the Bible. "Not having read a single Baptist book or tract, I publish the following work as an independent testimony to the exclusive right of believers to Christian baptism" *p.* iv. The

book itself too shows the use of the Scriptures almost on every page. It abounds with quotations and texts. In this respect however it is only a striking exemplification of the vanity and nonsense of the pretension, on which it is thus ostentatiously made to rest. Mr. Noel affects to come to the Bible like an empty vase theologically, leaving behind him all other education and tradition, in order to be filled purely from its gushing contents; and yet it comes only to this at last, that he divests himself of the old universal church faith, the substance of catholic thought as we have it embodied in the Creed, and brings along with him another different habit of his own, which after all is the result too of education, and in this respect as far removed at least from independence as the most sound church feeling. It is perfectly idle for him to pretend, that he has studied the Bible without prejudice or pre-occupation. His study has been throughout from a given theological standpoint, carrying in itself from the start the necessity of just such views and aspects as it is found then to offer to his eye. Another standpoint would clothe it with a very different sense; and it is sheer impudence, when *such* private judgment undertakes to make its observations of universal value, as the very mind of the sacred volume itself, and requires all other judgment, however widely and long established, to fall respectfully into its wake. Allow the premises of the Baptist, grant him his theory of Christianity to begin with, (as Puritanism is prone always to do, holding in truth too generally the same theory as its own,) and it becomes a comparatively easy thing for him to establish his favorite conclusions and also to find them satisfactorily reflected from many passages of the Bible. The universal necessary first condition for the right understanding and right interpretation of the Scriptures, is sympathy with the general fact of Christianity, and a living comprehension in its true catholic mystery as it has stood from the beginning. Without this, the more independent and single the expounder may be, the more empty and jejune ordinarily will be the character also of his expositions. Mr. Noel, we are sorry to say, furnishes no exception to this rule. His piety has no power to redeem the impotency of his false position. The use of the Bible in his hands is superficial in the extreme. We have text upon text, and quotation on quotation; the *sound* of the Bible forever ringing in our ears, from one end of the book to the other; but it is the Bible for the most part turned into mere commonplace and outside talk, with almost no regard whatever to its interior substance and sense.

The book exemplifies again the vanity of the pretence, that

the unsacramental system is more favorable to religious *spirituality* than the catholic. The Quakers and Baptists both claim to be more spiritual than the Church generally; and they try to make good this claim, by reducing religion as much as possible to the actings of individual mind and will, in the case of those who are its subjects. But spiritualism, in this form, is not true Christian spirituality, when all is done. On the contrary, it is just the reverse of this, and left to itself is sure to end in rationalistic misery and starvation. Without faith in catholic realities, there can be no true Christian spirituality. Mr. Noel's book affects to move in the highest region of experimental piety; and all the world knows him to be a truly pious man; but we find no quickening, elevating spirit whatever, in what he has here written. It is an irksome, insipid task, to follow him in his views of religion; so dreary and dry is the region through which they carry us; so cold and cheerless the results to which they bring us as their necessary end. The freshness and depth of a truly spiritual mind form no part of this plea for "believer's baptism." On the contrary, it is altogether mechanical and outward in its spirit. We feel ourselves surrounded, in reading it, with the atmosphere of rationalism. We seem to be feeding on husks, or vainly endeavoring to satisfy ourselves with the substance of the east wind.

The fundamental controversy in this case lies quite back of all Mr. Noel's argument. The question of the proper use of the sacraments, must depend in the first place on the true idea of their nature. The difference of the Baptists from the old catholic faith begins here; and unless it be properly met where it thus begins, it is of comparatively small account to make it the subject of contention at any other point. The controversy regards the existence of the sacraments themselves. The Baptists allow no sacrament at all *in the old church sense*. Mr. Noel's book proceeds throughout on the assumption, that baptism is no such sacrament, but a mere outward rite of divine appointment, carrying in it a different import altogether. Allow the old idea of a sacrament to retain its force, and his argument would be at an end. The great question then, and it is one of the very highest solemnity, resolves itself into this: Is baptism a sacrament, as the Church catholic has always believed, or is it only an outward law and sign?

A sacrament in the true church sense is not a mere outward rite, made obligatory by divine appointment. It carries in itself a peculiar constitution of its own. It consists, according to the old definition, of two parts, one outward and the other inward,

a visible terrene sign and an invisible celestial grace ; not related simply as corresponding facts, brought together by human thought ; but the one actually bound to the other in the way of most real mystical or sacramental union, causing the last to be objectively at hand in one and the same transaction with the first. Dissolve this mystical bond, and at once the old conception of a sacrament is gone at the same time. You may still retain a rite or ceremony which you dignify with this venerable name ; but you will not have what the Church, from the beginning, has understood herself to possess in the holy mysteries of baptism and the Lord's supper.

Now Mr. Noel acknowledges no such bond whatever, in the ordinance of baptism. It is for him purely an outward institution, the whole sense and value of which turn on its giving the believer an opportunity to show his obedience to the authority by which it has been appointed. It is very significant, that the Baptists generally are so prone to speak of the ordinance as a rite or law ; showing themselves to have no sense of its being anything more, in this view, than an outward rule imposed by Christ. The "law of baptism," as they are fond of styling it, sinks into a full parallel with the services of the Old Testament, and due regard for it is then made to stand, naturally enough, in an exact compliance with all that may be supposed to belong to the letter of it in such view. The idea of a living power in the ordinance itself, seems to have no place at all in their minds.

Mr. Noel appears never to dream of the possibility of any such objective grace in baptism. It is for him mainly an act of mere profession on the part of the believing subject. "A true faith must manifest itself, and baptism is one appointed mode of its manifestation" *p.* 45. "Since faith is said to save us, because it is the instrument through which God saves us, so baptism is said to save us, because it is the necessary expression of true faith" *p.* 46. "Baptism is the profession of faith, the public confession of Christ, without which confession there is no true faith and no salvation" *p.* 97. "If baptism be simply a profession of repentance and faith, then the expression, 'Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins,' is equivalent to, 'Repent and believe for the remission of sins.' Remission of sins attends baptism simply because it attends faith" *p.* 101. Could language well make the thing more explicit ? The religious force of baptism is purely and wholly subjective ; it is nothing save as it serves to represent and manifest a certain state of mind in the believer ; the idea of any *other* power belonging to it as a Divine act is wholly excluded, as being no better than vision-



ary superstition. In this way it ceases to be a sacrament altogether; for a sacrament carrying in it no objective grace, is a contradiction in terms. To abjure the idea of baptismal grace, is to break with the old idea of baptism throughout, and to treat it as an idle dream.

A certain relation to grace, indeed, the system is still willing to allow. But this is taken to be wholly outward. Baptism signifies something spiritual; only however in the way of suggestion to the human mind. No inward, necessary, present bond is allowed to hold between the sign and the thing signified. The transaction outwardly considered enters not at all as an essential factor, into the constitution of the fact which is consummated by its means. It is merely appended to this as an accidental badge. So Mr. Noel takes it throughout. But this is not the form in which baptism, from the beginning, has claimed to be acknowledged as a sacrament. Most clearly in the New Testament, it is made to enter efficaciously, as a divine act, into the mystery of the new birth. Whatever of difficulty may attach to this conception, we have no right to thrust it violently aside for the purpose of accommodating a different theory. The letter of the Bible is too plain, and the sense of it too awfully solemn, to bear any such spiritualism as that. Baptism here is no mere sign, no simply outward adjunct or accident. It is the washing of regeneration; it saves us; it is for the remission of sins. The mere ceremony of course is not this *per se*; but it goes actually to complete the work of our salvation, as the mystical exhibition in real form of that divine grace, without which all our subjective exercises in the case must amount to nothing. Such is the doctrine of the New Testament; and so accordingly the whole ancient Church believed. We have this faith formally proclaimed in the Creed; for the article there affirming the *remission of sins*, as may be easily shown, refers to this as a fact accomplished in the Church by baptism. The objective presence of such supernatural grace in the mystical transaction, is the very thing which faith is required to embrace; as without it indeed there would be no room for its exercise. That the Church otherwise attributed such grace to the sacrament, universally and at all times, is too well known to admit any dispute. Mr. Noel then, and the Baptists as a body, are completely at issue here with primitive Christianity; and the difference is one of vast magnitude and moment. It regards not simply the mode of baptism and its proper subjects, but its essential nature and constitution. Whether agreement in other respects can or cannot be shown, is after all comparatively immaterial; the grand

VOL. II.—NO. III. 16\*

discord, and that which must forever mar all harmonies besides, lies here at the very bottom of the entire subject. What the primitive Church owned and saw in baptism, Mr. Noel neither owns nor sees in it at all. It is for him no SACRAMENT whatever, but only a rule or sign dignified with such title.

He has one chapter devoted to the "effects of baptism," which sets this in the clearest light. Christianity, he tells us, stands in the pardon of sins through Christ for such as trust in his grace, and a life of subsequent consecration to his service. It is meet, in this case, that the believer should openly profess his faith. The Church too, "the society of Christ's disciples," needs some public guaranty of right behavior, on the part of those who are admitted to its fellowship. "Both these objects are secured by the appointed rite of baptism" *p.* 264. It works well besides on the subject himself, on the congregation he joins, and on spectators generally. The subject of so public and solemn a rite, by proclaiming his faith to the world, is laid under bond to follow Christ truly, and by such decision gains strength for the duty. "A thousand checks to sin and a thousand aids to godliness are that day assumed; faith, hope, and love are likely to be confirmed" *p.* 266. The sight is edifying to the church; as it serves to revive and quicken old associations. Witnesses, on the outside of the church, may be affected by it also in the way of salutary reflection. The rite serves the purpose of a key moreover, in the hands of a church, to lock out the world from her communion, *p.* 269, 270. These good effects however belong only to the ordinance as applied to actual believers. Infant baptism works very differently. It sets aside the other practice, with all its connections so admirably suited for *effect*. "Through the baptism of unconscious infants, the solemn, affecting, and salutary baptism of repentance, faith, and self-dedication to God, has nearly vanished from the churches" *p.* 272. And what benefit has been gained by the substitution? Mr. Noel can find none whatever. Under the Mosaic economy, circumcision admitted its subject to great privileges from which the uncircumcised were excluded. But Christianity owns no such exclusion. The child, baptized or unbaptized, occupies the same ground. Parents too derive no help from the rite. "Pious parents do not need this new inducement to educate their children well; ungodly parents cannot feel its force" *p.* 273. The churches themselves regard it with no interest; "except as far as superstition has invested it with imaginary spiritual power, it seems to have dwindled into a formality." Even in this view however it works mischievously, as fostering always the notion

of a saving relation in some way to Christ, in the case of all its subjects. Still worse, it runs naturally into the figment of down-right baptismal regeneration.

Our object in this sketch of Mr. Noel's theory of what belongs, and what does not belong, to the efficacy of Christian baptism, is not to make it the subject of formal trial; but simply to show, how completely it excludes every thought of anything like grace or power, mystically present in the ordinance of itself; how it nullifies, out and out, the idea of its objective force as Christ's act, and resolves it wholly into a thing for effect, in the way of pure subjectivity, on the side of men; how, in one word, it overthrows its character as a *sacrament* altogether, in the old church sense, and mocks us in place of this with a rationalistic shadow played off in its name.

Such a view of baptism is inseparably joined with a corresponding view of the Church. This is no longer the living revelation of Christ in the world, the mystical body of which he is the glorious Head, but takes rather the character of an abstraction, signifying merely the general faith and union of those who embrace the gospel. This involves again a corresponding view of Christ's person, and so in the end of the whole system of Christianity. All has a tendency to quit the form of concrete fact, and run into the form of abstract thought.

Where theology comes to be of this sort, we have a dry mechanical separation perpetually between the objective and subjective factors of the christian salvation, which has the effect in the end of thrusting the first out of the process altogether. Redemption is made to be a plan or device, over which God presides precisely as the mind of man may be said to rule a machine; and Christ comes in simply in the way of outward instrumental help, to carry out the scheme. The objective side of the salvation is wholly beyond the world, in the Mind of God; the subjective side of it holds in certain exercises brought to pass in particular men, in view of God's grace and by the help of his Spirit; Christ serves only to make room, in some way, for the ready communication of one world in such style with the other. One of the worst results of this way of looking at things is the notion of a *limited atonement*; according to which Christ is taken to have come into the world and died, not for the race as a whole, but only for a part of it, the election of grace as it is sometimes styled, culled out from the general mass beforehand by divine decree. Where Christ is made to stand on the outside of our salvation, and this is felt to have its principle in God's purpose and will touching men in a direct way, it is not possible

indeed to avoid this consequence; unless by swinging over to the other extreme of such an indefinite atonement, as either turns Christ's work into a Pelagian show or lands us in the error of Universalism.

The only full refuge from these false abstractions is found in the right sense of Christ, as being himself the sum and substance of the salvation he has brought in the world, and in this view the organic comprehension from the start of its whole compass and extent. The new creation is complete in him as a boundless whole, bringing our human life in full into union with God, independently of its triumphs in particular believers. So it comes before us in the Creed. Here are no abstractions. The world is saved in Christ; and this salvation is, in its own nature, as wide as the world. It challenges our faith and homage, as a power of redemption really and truly present in the Church, and fully commensurate in such form, at the same time, with the entire tract of our general human misery and sin.

Here it is now that we reach the grand argument for infant baptism. It lies not in the letter of the Scriptures, but in the life of Christianity itself, the true idea of the Church, the mystery of Christ as the Second Adam, in whom redemption and salvation are brought to pass for the race. Let it be felt that Christianity is a new order of life constituted by the Fact of the Incarnation, and that men are saved only by being comprehended in it in a real way; and it will be felt at the same time, that it must be, in this form, fully commensurate with the fact of humanity itself as a whole. The conception of a partial Christ, a Mediator representing in himself thus a part only of our general manhood and not the whole, strikes directly at the realness and truth of the whole mystery. What a gross imagination it would be, for instance, to limit and bound the capacity of this Mediatorial constitution, by any merely chronological or geographical line in the history of the race; allowing it to be of force for one certain tract of time, but not for another; restricting it to one country or continent with the exclusion of the whole world besides; making it a sufficient source of redemption for Caucasian blood, but not for that of the Negro or Malay! But can it be any more tolerable to right christian feeling, we ask, to limit and bound the force of this salvation by a line sundering in fancy and childhood from riper age, and to make it of real effect on one side of this line only and not on the other? Humanity is not merely our mature human life, but all the stages also through which this is reached. It includes infancy and childhood as a necessary part of its constitution; a large proportion of it exists



always under this form ; nearly one half of it perhaps is cut off by death before it comes to any higher state. Now the question is not simply : Can such infants be saved if they should happen to die ? but this rather : Is there any real room for them, living or dying, in the concrete mystery of the new creation, in the communion of Christ's Mediatoral Life, in the bosom of the Holy Catholic Church ? Does the nature of the Second Adam take in one half of the necessary life of the race only, while it hopelessly excludes the other ? Such a thought goes at once to undermine the whole fact of the Incarnation. Christ must be of the same length and breadth in all respects with humanity as a whole, in order to be at all a real and true Mediator. He must be commensurate with the universal process of humanity from infancy to old age, as well as with its mere numerical extent. This is implied in the manner of his incarnation itself. His manhood was a process, starting in the Virgin's womb ; and in this character it took up into itself, as a power of redemption, the entire range of our existence. He sanctified infancy and childhood, says Irenæus, by making them stages of his own life. This expresses a just and sound feeling. It grows forth from the true doctrine of Christ's Person. It lies involved in the Creed. It filled the heart of the ancient Church ; and it found its natural, we might say almost necessary expression, in Infant Baptism.

This is more than any merely outward rule. The Baptist is forever harping on the letter of the law ; and insists that a case which is not provided for in express terms by this, must be taken to be without force or right. We hold however that there is monstrous falsehood, as well as miserable Jewish pedantry, in pretending to get Christianity like so much clock-work from the text of the Bible, in such purely outward and mechanical style. Christianity has a life and constitution of its own, in the bosom of which only, and by the power of which alone, the true sense of the Bible can be fairly understood ; and in this view it is, that the practice of infant baptism by the universal Church from the beginning comes to its full significance and weight. We not only infer from it the authority of express precept and example going before, in the age of the Apostles ; but we see in it also, (and this is its main value,) the very soul and spirit of Christianity itself, actualizing and expounding in a living way the sense of its own word. If it could be clearly made out that the household baptism of the New Testament included no infants ; nay, if it were certain that the Church had no apostolical rule whatever in the case, but had gradually settled here into

her own rule; we should hold this still to be of truly divine authority, and the baptism of infants of necessary christian obligation, as the only proper sense and meaning of the New Testament institution, interpreted thus to its full depth by the christian life itself. in this way too the analogy of the Jewish covenant, embracing as it did infants as well as adults, and the analogy we may add of our universal human society, organized everywhere after the same law, bring with them at last their true force. On this subject Mr. Noel is exceedingly superficial and flat. True, Christianity is not a secular institute; its sphere is the spiritual world; its privileges are for the soul mainly and not for the body. But still, is it not a perfectly *human* order; nay, the absolute end and perfection of humanity; and must it not, in this view, show itself proportional and true throughout to the actual organization of man's life in its universal character? Make it an unearthly system, playing into the world's economy without any regard to its natural structure as this holds in other spheres, and you do as much as you well can to turn it into magic. As such a human constitution in Christ then, the new creation, with all its spirituality, must of necessity take up into itself the entire compass and power of the old creation; not destroying its constituent elements and laws, but fulfilling their inmost sense rather and raising them to their highest power. In harmony with the principle that underlies the covenant of nature, as well as the Jewish covenant, binding the state of children to that of their parents even in the lowest and most outward temporal interests, Christianity too, the end of all other covenants, in order that it may be found to be such universal truth in fact and no lie, must show itself able and willing to embrace children as really as adults in its bosom, thus covering with its grace the whole extent of our nature as it lies defiled and defaced by sin. If infants were not comprehended in the law of sin, there might be some reason for holding them to be also shut out from the law of life in Christ Jesus. To make them participant of the curse, and yet incapable of having part really in Him by whom it is removed, would be absolutely monstrous. Every such view is in full contradiction to Rom. v. 12-21; where we are plainly taught, that the grace of the Second Adam is, in its own nature, more than commensurate with the ruin of the First. The economy of salvation must necessarily be so framed, as to make room at least for every necessary class and state of our general life. Like its antitype in the days of Noah, the ark of the Church must be able to save infants and children, as well as persons of higher age. So the Church felt

in the beginning; and on this ground, with the fullest right and reason, proceeded to incorporate infants into her communion by the initiatory seal of holy baptism. Not to have done so would have been to belie the profoundest instincts of the christian life itself, and to jeopardize at the same time all firm and constant faith in the objective mystery of her own constitution.

Here we see the lean and abstract misery of the Baptist system. Christianity, according to its apprehension, has no power to take up infants, (a large part of the world at any given time,) in a direct and real way, into its constitution. It has to do immediately and properly only with believers, personally conscious subjects. Are infants then incapable of salvation; or do they need no salvation? The Baptist is not prepared to rest in either of these alternatives. Infants he holds to be naturally sinful and unregenerate. Those that die in infancy moreover, he tells us, are saved. How? By the fiat of the Almighty changing their bad nature, as he might bid stones to become children of Abraham. And so it is allowed, that he may in rare instances regenerate also infants that do not die. In both cases the regeneration is *for Christ's sake*, so far as motive is concerned in the Divine Mind; but in neither case can it be said at all to fall within the actual scope of the christian salvation, strictly so called, as we find it going forward in the Church. This is for believers only, and has no power to reach children in any natural organic way. If saved at all, they are saved out of Christ, and beyond the Church, by a grace for which he may be considered in some sense the occasion, but of which he is in no sense either the medium or source. And so as a general thing infants have no part or lot in his kingdom, no right, or title, or power, to be incorporated into his family. That saving grace of which baptism is the sign and seal, cannot be made in any way to come near to their fallen estate, or to fold them lovingly in its merciful embrace. They have no power yet to think, to understand, to repent, to believe, to accomplish in full the subjective side of this salvation; and so there is no room to conceive of their being set in any real connection with it under its objective view. They are by their very nature inaccessible to all its provisions and powers; as much so as though they had no part in the life of humanity whatever. They are disqualified constitutionally for *christian* salvation.

We see no escape from this conclusion, on Baptist premises. If children may not be baptized, they cannot in any way be gathered into the bosom of the Church. Then it cannot be said that Christ has room for them at present in his arms. His

grace may have regard to them prospectively ; but where they are just now, by the fearful disabilities of childhood, it cannot reach them or touch them in the way of help. Their only hope is in the "uncovenanted mercies of God," and his power at pleasure to save *without Christ*.

Dreadful, terrible thought ! It is truly wonderful, that it should ever be endured at all by the heart of any Christian parent. The old catholic faith, with its ideas of sacramental grace and educational sanctification, the powers of heaven underlying and supporting the process of piety in a real way, through the Church, from the hour of baptism onward to the hour of death, as compared with this, may well seem like the land of Beulah, full of green pastures and springs, in contrast with a wilderness of sand.

Infant baptism belongs essentially to the theory of Christianity, as this stood in the beginning, and as we find it uttered in the Apostles' Creed. This is generally admitted by such learned men as Augusti, Neander, Gieseler, &c.; who at the same time are found sanctioning the opinion, that it did not come into actual practice probably before the third century ; and to whose authority accordingly the Baptists are now in the habit of appealing triumphantly, as in some sense settling the historical argument on their side. They run away with what is thus granted to them as a bare fact, without the least regard to the form and inward reason of it ; and at once construe into a plump innovation and abuse, what these authorities take to be intelligible only as the fair and legitimate outbirth of the christian life as it went before. Allow that infants were not generally baptized before the third century, and the cause of the Baptists is still by no means made out. The question returns, How came such baptism *then* into quiet general use ? Was it in full antagonism to the genius of Christianity as it stood before ; or did it spring spontaneously out of this, in the way of natural and necessary derivation ? In the last view, the fact is intelligible, and offers no offence to historical criticism. So it is taken by the learned men, Neander and others, to whom we have just referred. This however suits not at all the object of the Baptists. They insist on the other view, as the only one that deserves to be considered correct. Here however they part from their authorities altogether, and set themselves at the same time in broad and open conflict with the truth of history. They assume that the Church started with a theory of Christianity identical with their own, and that the practice in question crept in consequently in opposition to this as a gross downright corrup-



tion. But with the Baptist theory to start from, such as we now find it, not only in regard to infant salvation, but in regard also to the whole constitution of the Sacraments and the Church, it is fairly inconceivable that in the course of a single century any such change as this could ever have come to pass. The Baptist theory is root and branch unchurchly and unsacramental, spiritualistic, rationalistic, and opposed to all thought of mystical objective efficiency in the means of grace outwardly considered. How then could it generate in so short a time the idea of infant baptism? This would be, in such a case, no growth or development in any sense whatever, but direct contradiction and revolution; as much so as though we should fancy the doctrine of transubstantiation springing from the dry loins of Quakerism itself. It is most amply clear however that this whole most unnatural and unphilosophical hypothesis of the Baptists, is an *assumption* purely and nothing besides. However infant baptism came in, it never had a theory of Christianity behind it like that which stares upon us from Mr. Noel's book. There is not a trace of it to be found in the primitive Church, unless among the Gnostics. If anything in the world be plain, it is that the entire genius and faith of the early Church, from the very age of the Apostles, lay in the direction of this practice, and fell towards it with natural gravitation, instead of looking or leaning in any other direction.

But, says Mr. Noel, the Church fell also into the practice of infant communion, and continued it for centuries; which however has since come to be acknowledged universally an abuse; and this must neutralize completely the force of the view now presented. Not at all, we reply. It only goes to show it more certainly true and correct. With the Baptist theory to start from, so easy and general a lapse of the early christian world into this practice must be counted still more inexplicable than the rise of the other superstition; as it must go still farther also to strip ancient Christianity of its last title to rational sympathy and respect. Allow however in the mind of the Church from the beginning the presence of a different theory, including the sense of an organic power working objectively in the christian communion, and concentrating itself especially in the mystery of sacramental grace, and it is no longer difficult to comprehend how it was possible to extend the use not only of the first sacrament, but of the second also, to infants as well as adults; while the judgment is still approved as wise and right, by which in the end a distinction was made between the two cases, and infant communion disallowed while infant baptism was suffered to remain in

force. The Baptist theory could never have made any such distinction ; just as little as it could have had power to originate either the one side of it or the other. Sympathy with the sacramental faith of the early Church, will enable us to apologize here for this excess in her practice ; while at the same time we have no difficulty in seeing and allowing it to have been an excess ; and are not for this reason tempted at all to resolve the just conception from which such excess grew, and by which only it is made intelligible, into a baseless figment of superstition ; as little precisely, we may say, as we are tempted to part with the whole mystery of Christ's presence in the Lord's supper, because it has been carried by some to the manifest extreme of transubstantiation. After all, even infant communion, properly set aside as it has been by the christian world, is far nearer to the first life of Christianity, and less revolting we will add to the sensibilities of a sound church faith, than the error which will not suffer infants to come to Christ in the Church at all, but by refusing them the sacrament of holy baptism virtually places that whole age, by physical calamity, beyond the pale of his redemption.

We do not allow however, in the view of the matter now presented, that the practice of infant baptism came in only with the third century. The concession as made by Neander and others would not save the cause of the Baptists, if it were true ; for it rests on an entirely different view of early Christianity from that which *their* use of it requires. But the concession itself, we are well satisfied, goes altogether beyond the line of justice and truth. The most that can be allowed is, that infant baptism in the beginning was overshadowed, and thrown out of sight to a great extent, by the far more prevalent and prominent use of the sacrament for full grown converts ; and that no strict rule prevailed, making it of binding authority and necessity as in later times. That it was in actual use however, under such secondary and free aspect at least, even from the age of the Apostles, seems to admit of no serious question. It went hand in hand with the doctrine of native depravity, and gathered force more and more in proportion as this grew into distinct statement, and carried along with it the sense of its necessary counterpart in the doctrine of a real objective remedy for this ruin in Christ.

As presented to our view in the third century, the practice of infant baptism, as all scholars know, is no new or rare thing, but a fact of general and seemingly long established force. Origen never thinks of vindicating it as something lately introduced, but on the contrary appeals to it as an acknowledged church

usage, of apostolical derivation, in support of other truth. He does not argue from the doctrine of native depravity to the necessity of infant baptism; but from this last rather, as a sure and solid ground at hand in the universal sense of the Church, he draws proof for the certainty of that doctrine. "As baptism is given for the remission of sins" he says *hom. viii. in Levit.*, "the grace of it must seem to be superfluous when extended to infants also, as it is by the usage of the Church, if they have nothing in them that calls for remission." Again in *Luc. evang. hom. xiv.*: "Little children are baptized for the remission of sins. Of what sins? When have they sinned? Or how can any use of the laver apply to their case, unless in the sense of what we have just said, that no one is clean according to Job xiv. 4. And because by baptism the pollution of birth is removed, *little children also are baptized.* For except one be born of water and the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven." Again, on *Rom. v. 6.*: "*The Church received from the Apostles a tradition, to baptize little children also.* For they knew, as stewards of the divine mysteries, that there existed in all the true stain of sin, which needs to be washed away by water and the Spirit, whence even the body itself is styled a body of sin." Such is the clear testimony of Origen. That of Cyprian, in the same age, is if possible still more explicit and overwhelming. He indeed sets before us a dispute in relation to infant baptism. But this did not turn at all on the lawfulness or fitness of the thing itself. That was granted on all sides. Nobody then dreamed, it would appear, of calling it in question. The only doubt was, whether it was necessary to observe the analogy of the Jewish rule, fixing circumcision to the eighth day. Must infants wait at least that long for the sacrament, or might they be baptized at any time after birth? What a question this for the theology of our modern Baptists! Cyprian, supported by the unanimous voice of a whole council at Carthage a. 256, most distinctly affirms the latter view. The grace of God, he says, should be considered open and free to all, as it is needed by all; and we are bound accordingly to bring all, if possible, within its saving scope. If even grievous sins in the case of adults form no bar to their gracious acceptance in this holy sacrament, "how much less should the infant be debarred, which being recently born has not yet sinned at all, save as being naturally born from Adam it has contracted in its first nativity the contagion of original death, and which is the better prepared more easily to receive the remission of sins, for the very reason that the sins to be remitted are not of itself but from abroad, (*non propria sed aliena.*)"—*Epist. LIX ad Fidum.*

Origen and Cyprian, it will be borne in mind, belong to the first half of the third century. Their testimony then makes it clear, not only that infant baptism was in use at that time, but also that it was no partial nor new thing brought in a short time before. They refer to it as of general, everywhere acknowledged authority, and treat it as part and parcel of the ecclesiastical tradition handed down from the age of the Apostles. Now in these circumstances, it could not possibly have taken its rise only in the latter part even of the second century. Such a state of things of itself implies, that no memory ran to the contrary of it in the Church, and so that it must have started historically with the rise of the Church itself; and it is a strange judgment certainly which Suicer is quoted as uttering, when he says: "For the first two centuries none were baptized, save such as were instructed in the faith and imbued with the doctrine of Christ, because of those words, '*He that believeth and is baptized*;' afterwards the opinion prevailed, that no one could be saved without baptism." With the practice of Origen's time before us, and the quiet faith that prevailed in regard to it, we need no very explicit testimony to assure us of what had place during the century before. It is enough, that no opposing voice is heard, that the positive presumption already secured is met with no contradiction under a different form. The Baptists affect to make light of the historical authorities quoted from the second century in favor of infant baptism; they are so few and of so little force. Mr. Noel cites them from the pages of the learned Bingham, with two marks of admiration in every case, (thus!;) in token of his profound surprise, to find so vast a superstructure made to rest on pillars so very slender and slim. But it should be remembered in the first place, that we have but little patristic literature to quote from in the second century, on any subject. And then it should be remembered again, in the second place, that the *onus probandi* here, the burden of citing witnesses and authorities, lies on the Baptists themselves, and not on the advocates of infant baptism; who have the clear practice of the universal Church on their side at the going out of the second century, and most full right accordingly to take the same thing, for granted of the century throughout, unless cause to the contrary can be shown. The paucity and leanness of proof, in this view, fall wholly to the side on which Mr. Noel himself stands. All turns at last on a single passage from Tertullian; and this so little pertinent to the purpose it is employed to serve, that we might well bestow all Mr. Noel's marks of admiration upon it singly and alone. In the passage referred to, as is well known,



(*de bapt. c. 18.*) Tertullian takes occasion, on a view of his own, to recommend a delay of baptism in certain cases and states. Children in particular, he tells us, should wait till they are able to come on their own profession. Unmarried persons too he recommends to use a similar procrastination. And what now, we ask, follows from this strange oracle of the African Father? That infant baptism was a new thing in the Church, or of only narrow custom and use? Just the reverse. We *know* from the testimony of Origen and Cyprian, who join hands with him in time, that the fact was quite otherwise; and the same thing is implied most clearly in this passage itself. Tertullian offers no objection to infant baptism, as being an innovation, or a thing against common rule; which he would have done most certainly, if there had been room for objecting to it in this way. He tacitly allows its general ecclesiastical authority, and simply sets over against this his own private speculation, resting on the danger of post-baptismal sins. Strange theology too he makes of it, in order to carry his point. "*Quid festinat innocens ætas ad remissionem peccatorum?*" The passage besides is as much against the baptism of the unmarried, as it is against the baptism of infants; and in this way, if it proves anything at all for the Baptists, it must be taken to prove vastly more than they want. Plainly, Tertullian stood here against the Church; and his voice passed off accordingly, almost without echo, in the progress of her subsequent history.

It is not necessary here to notice specifically the authorities back of Tertullian, that are brought forward by Bingham and others in favor of infant baptism. They are readily acknowledged to be somewhat vague and uncertain in their character; and taken simply by themselves they would be by no means sufficient to establish its practice. But we have no right so to take them by themselves. They must be taken in connection with the light thrown back upon them by the known practice of the Church at the close of the century, as well as from the theory of sacramental grace answerable to this practice which we find in the Church from the beginning; and so taken, we have no hesitation to say, they are altogether relevant and full of force.<sup>1</sup>

It has been sometimes said that the practice of infant baptism gained credit and became general finally, through the influence particularly of Augustine's dogma of original sin. This how-

<sup>1</sup> See the subject well presented in the work entitled: *Das Sakrament der Taufe nebst den anderen damit Zusammenhängenden Akten der Initiation*: By J. W. F. Höfing. vol. 1, p. 98-123.

ever is altogether unhistorical. The necessity of it was not felt to lie in any relation to the special view of Augustine on this subject, but in the pressure of the universally acknowledged need of regeneration, as affirmed by our Saviour, John iii. 5 ; as we have had opportunity to see already in the quotation from Origen and Cyprian. Augustine himself moreover, like Origen argues not from his doctrine to the necessity of infant baptism, but just in the reverse order. Infant baptism stands, in the controversy between him and his opponents, for a given sure and certain fact, of apostolical credit and force ; and on the ground of this broad *datum* he plants one of the main pillars of his doctrine. The mystery must be taken, here to be fallacious he says, and not trustworthy, when infants are baptized for the remission of sins, if there be in them no sin to remit. Pelagius and his party felt themselves sorely embarrassed with this argument ; but they never ventured to quarrel with the fact on which it was built. On the contrary, they allowed it also in its full length and breadth, showing plainly thus their sense of its impregnable settlement in the previous history of the church back to the time of the Apostles. For nothing certainly would have suited their cause better than to have been able to show the whole thing a superstitious corruption and abuse, brought in a few generations only before, *against* the universal practice of the primitive Church, and without mention till the time of Tertullian ; as all this has now come to be clear and plain, in this age of telescopic vision, to the eyes of such men as Mr. Noel, looking back through a vista of more than fifteen centuries to the same period.

In this controversy with the Baptists, all depends on taking right ground. It regards not simply the difference of practice with which it is immediately concerned in an outward view, but falls over as we have seen on a difference back of this, and of far more inward and profound character, touching the nature of the Sacraments themselves and the true idea of the Christian Church. The true issue in the end is : Church or No-Church ; sacrament or mere moral sign. The rejection of infant baptism turns on a full renunciation of the theory of Christianity, out of which the practice grew with inward necessity at the beginning. The modern Baptist is inwardly at war, in the whole posture of his faith, with the true sense of the Apostles' Creed. He has given up the whole idea of sacramental grace as an obsolete superstitious figment. What the ancient Church took to be the sense of a sacrament, and what in this view the Reformers also felt themselves bound to hold fast as a necessary part of Christi-

anity, he most deliberately gives to the winds. A sacrament is for him another thing altogether. This it is, we say, that forms the real significance and the true deep solemnity of this controversy; and on this ground should it be made always to rest. It is of little account to contend with the Baptists, and the contest is likely always to have but small success in the end, if its true ultimate sense be not felt and asserted firmly in this way.

It is not to be concealed, however, that no small amount of the opposition which is made among Protestants to the system of the Baptists, at the present time, is not planted on the great ultimate issue here noticed at all; but on the contrary takes side in regard to it with the interest opposed, as though that primary issue were fully antiquated and no longer of any force whatever; in consequence of which all such defence of the truth, (the outward shell of it only forsaken of its proper soul,) is found to be more or less powerless and vain. It is a poor business to contend for infant baptism, if all the principles on which it rested in the beginning and that of right still lie at the ground of it, be in the first place rationalistically surrendered. Of such practical treason, secretly aiding and abetting the very enemy with which it outwardly makes show of battle, we have melancholy exemplifications on all sides. It is lifting itself into view continually among all our sects, as far as the Puritan principle has been able to gain onesided and separate supremacy at the cost of the Catholic. It fights the Baptists; but in doing so grants them all their principal premises, and so leaves nothing to fight about that deserves any true zeal. It eviscerates the sacraments of all objective force; denies their mystical character altogether; turns them into simple signs and ceremonies, that have no inward connection whatever with the spiritual realities they represent. What are we to think of a Presbyterian minister for instance, taking pains at the Lord's table, without the fear of Calvin or the Westminster Confession before his eyes, to guard his people against the danger of fancying any *mystery* at all in the transaction; or carefully reminding them, over the "laver of regeneration," that they must not dream for a moment of any *grace*, exhibited or conferred through the holy institution. And all this too, in token of his zeal for evangelical spirituality, poor man, as contrasted with the far off mummeries of Puseyism and Rome! When it has come to this, the defence of infant baptism is indeed reduced to bad plight; for its outworks are gone, and its main garrison is virtually delivered into the enemy's hands. It cannot be defended any longer as a sacrament, as the thing it was counted to be in the beginning; and so its defence

cannot be made to rest on the grounds and reasons which originally brought it to pass. It is changed into a new sense. It has become a mere outward rule. It carries another relation altogether to the true and proper life of Christianity; and by such shifted position it is in fact shorn of its stays and props, whether in the form of testimony from the Bible or as offered in the voice and practice of the early Church.

Such unsacramental Pædo-baptism labors, in truth, under a threefold fatal defect, in its war with the Baptists. *In the first place*, it puts a hammer in their hands to break its own head with, by yielding their false principle that the Bible *per se* must settle, in purely outward and mechanical style, this and all other points of christian faith and practice. That is not the way in which the Bible is to be used. It is not constructed on any such mechanical plan, and never offers itself so to our faith. Such slavery to the letter is Jewish, not Christian. By consenting to it, in the case before us, the unsacramental advocates of infant baptism kill their own cause at once. It is perfectly vain, to think of making out a clear plea for it from the letter of the Bible. It never came into practice that way at first, and there is no such foundation for it to rest upon now. Recourse is had accordingly to indirect and circuitous proof always, based more or less on analogy, inference, and presumption; and to crown all, the subsequent practice of the Church is lodged in as a sort of supplemental voucher. But here the Baptist falls in with a loud protest; and he has fair right to do so, on the *common* ground occupied by the parties. "The text, the text, and nothing but the text; no gloss, no hypothesis, no tradition; nothing less than a direct *Thus saith the Lord* can be entitled to confidence in so grave a case." Thus runs the everlasting watchword, and the mouth of the adversary is fairly stopped. He may talk on indeed; but his talk is to no purpose, unless it be simply to reveal the nakedness of his own self-contradictory posture.—*Secondly*, the advocacy in question is still farther at fault in the use it allows itself to make, supplementally, of Christian antiquity. The practice of infant baptism in the early Church grew forth, organically we might say, from a certain theory of Christianity itself, which stands out more or less clearly to view in all the doctrines and institutions of the Church at the time. It was no separate fact merely, resting on naked precept and tradition; it belonged to the life of the universal system in which it had place; its proper significance and force stood in its relations, its theological connections, its ecclesiastical surroundings. But now, in the case before us, no sort of regard is paid to this most obvious



and simple thought. Puritanism as a general thing, if we may believe at least *some* of its witnesses, owns no agreement or sympathy with the mind of the early Church, as this meets us in the Apostles' Creed, considers its theory of Christianity superstitious, and repudiates especially out and out its imagination of grace in the Sacraments. And yet, in controversy with the Baptists, this same Puritanism appeals to the practice of the early Church in favor of infant baptism, and tries to eke out its *Bible* argument, otherwise most impotent and lame, by the convenient help here offered in the way of tradition! But this is unfair, and may be justly charged with practical equivocation. It is like the trick of arguing from the mere sound of a text in the Scriptures, without any regard to the sense required by its context. What right have those who refuse the ecclesiastical context of infant baptism, as it stood in the early Church, to go thither in quest of testimonies and authorities in favor of it, as it now happens to be in authority among themselves under a wholly different view? They pervert in such case what they are pleased to cite and quote, by sundering the fact in question from its necessary connections, and forcing it to stand in other connections altogether, that actually make it to carry a new sense. When Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, &c., are pressed into service as witnesses, by this unchurchly and unsacramental school, they are always of course turned more or less into the character of wire-worked puppets; and the shrewd Baptist may well be excused for his smile of sarcastic triumph, as he charges home on *such* adversaries the double inconsistency, first of calling in the aid of any tradition whatever, and then of wresting this tradition out of all its living articulations to make it fit for their own use.—And this brings into view finally the *third* defect belonging to the school. In thus refusing and disowning the connections out of which infant baptism sprang in the beginning, it shows itself insensible also to the true interior sense and reason of it in its own nature. Only in the character of a grace-bearing sacrament, according to the view taken of it by the early Church, and only in connection with the idea of an objective salvation in Christ commensurate with the entire tract of our human life from infancy to old age, can baptism be vindicated rationally as the proper privilege of infants. Renounce this old theory of Christianity, and it is no longer possible to make any satisfactory stand here against the plausible reasonings of the Baptists. If baptism be a mere outward confession on the part of the subject, or if it be a sign simply of certain things which must be brought to pass by human thought and will, no good

VOL. II.—NO. III. 17\*

reason certainly can be assigned for employing it in the case of infants. Those accordingly who deny baptismal grace, making the rite thus to be in reality no sacrament at all but only an outward law or rule of Divine appointment, show themselves unable always to meet the demands of this controversy, and in truth betray it, as we have before said, into the hands of the Baptists. As a mere sign, infant baptism has no authority in the Bible, no sanction in ancient church practice, and no apology in reason or common sense.

Where such low view of the sacrament has come to prevail, pædo-baptism falls necessarily into the character of a simple ecclesiastical tradition, and is looked upon as a sort of outward custom only, which it is not becoming to make the subject of any very earnest zeal one way or another. No special stress accordingly is laid upon it in a practical view; no special regard is had to it in the subsequent training of children. Pains are taken rather to make it of no effect for the purposes of Christianity. It is treated as a nullity. All faith in it as Christ's act, is carefully discouraged; and the first object oftentimes would seem to be to smother and crush in the baptized child all sense of privilege on the score of such adoption into God's family, and to substitute for it the sense of membership only and wholly in the family of Satan. We have heard a Presbyterian minister say publicly on this very subject: That he would consider it a calamity to have his children make any account of their baptism in this view. The sacrament to his mind palpably had no force whatever, except as the thing signified by it might be brought to pass subsequently, from a wholly different quarter and in a wholly different way; in order to which, the more it could itself be kept out of sight, in the meantime, the better. How is it possible, where practice thus gives the lie to all the mystery should mean, to show any proper zeal, or constancy, or ability, in its defence? Infant baptism, like the question of sprinkling, becomes a mere circumstance, lying on the outside of the "evangelical system," in which all spiritual christians, be they Baptist or Pædo-baptist, may still join happily with one and the same mind; provided only they have grace enough not to fall out by the way, over a matter of such subordinate worth. No wonder in these circumstances, that the cause of the Baptists, should eat like a cancer, and send its rationalistic roots forth far and wide into the life of the Church. No wonder that the *ceremony* of baptizing infants, even among those who are still nominally its friends, should seem to grow more loose and rickety always in actual practice; though we confess we were not pre-

pared for some astounding results on this subject, which have been lately brought into view from an examination of the statistical reports published by the last O. S. Presbyterian Assembly. The Episcopalians quote the fact in proof of a sad falling away from sound church feeling: while the Baptists echo it triumphantly, as a lively illustration of the variance which exists between the piety of the age and the force of this old tradition, as well as a pleasing evidence that it is destined soon to pass away entirely in the universal prevalence of their own truly rational faith. In any view it deserves attention.

Infant baptism taken as a mere abstract rite or usage, can never maintain its ground. As it grows from the church system, so it can never thrive or prosper truly save in the bosom of this system. It is properly but the initiative of all that is comprehended in a true church life, as a process of preparation for heaven. Take away the idea of this process, as something needed to carry forward and complete what is thus begun, and the true sense of the sacrament is gone. Infant baptism assumes the possibility of educational religion, under the special appliances of the Church, and looks to it as its own necessary complement. The idea of *confirmation* is required to bring it to its true and full sense. Where faith remains at all in its character as a sacrament, it will be felt to carry in it a demand for such personal acknowledgment and response on the part of its subject, at the proper time, under the hand of the Church; which in such case will not be viewed as a new and independent transaction, however, but rather as the natural and suitable close of the baptismal act itself. Let the idea of confirmation, on the other hand, be strange to the mind of any part of the Church, and the continuity lost sight of thus that should hold of right between the beginning of infant baptism and its proper end, and it will be found that to the same extent the institution itself is shorn of its significance and turned into an empty form.

Mr. Noel advocates free communion, as it is called, in opposition to the more strict practice generally observed among his Baptist brethren. His liberality in this respect rests, consistently enough, on the low view he takes of the sacraments. They are both for him mere acts of profession appointed by Christ, which have their whole use in the opportunity they give for "fulfilling righteousness" or complying with a rule of duty. Christianity itself, standing in the work of the Spirit and a corresponding experience in the believer, has place before and beyond all such profession, when it is sincere, and is just as complete without it as with it. Baptism ought indeed to precede the use of the

Lord's supper. But still a good profession may be made under this last form alone; and in the case of really pious persons, baptized in infancy, or rather according to this system not baptized at all, but afterwards self-devoted to Christ at the Lord's table, Mr. Noel thinks the rule in regard to the first sacrament, (or *sign*,) may safely be overlooked, in favor of Christian brotherhood and peace. And over against the strict theory as held by Baptists, this way of looking at the matter strikes us certainly as very reasonable and right. For what can well be a greater contradiction, than first to sunder the sacraments completely from the life and substance of Christianity, making them to be in truth no *sacraments* at all but only signs or statutes; and then to make the use of them under a given form notwithstanding the rule and measure of all full Christian communion, to the exclusion of a large proportion of the actually acknowledged piety of the world. To make at once so little of the sacraments, and yet again so much, is no better than letter-stiff pedantry of the most thoroughly Jewish type. We once heard a Baptist minister take great pains, on a communion occasion, to strip the service of every sort of mystical sense, setting it in full parallel finally with the Monument of Bunker Hill; and yet when all was done we were not allowed to come nigh it, although just before invited to participate in the services of the pulpit in front of which the monumental transaction took place. We felt it a real relief however to be thus excluded; for so utterly shorn of all true sacramental character did the altar appear in our eyes, that we could hardly have felt at liberty in our own mind to approach it as an altar at all. Strange and absurd exclusiveness, we felt at the time and still feel, which *includes* for its central mystery so poor a shadow!

We do not like the system of the Baptists. It overthrows the true idea of the Church. It makes the sacraments of no effect, and virtually destroys them altogether. It turns the whole gospel thus into a form different from that which it had in the beginning. The mystical side of Christianity is made to perish under its hands; while in every direction a cold calculating rationalism is offered to us in its stead. We do not wonder that it found so little favor in the eyes of early Protestantism; and the change which has come over much of our later Protestantism in regard to it, we hold to be an occasion for anxiety and alarm rather than for congratulation.

In all this article, it will be observed, we have carefully refrained from the question, What specifically is the power of baptism in the case of infants? This question is now moving the



Church of England to its very foundations; and it is one undoubtedly of the most profound and far reaching interest, for the general theology and church life of the age. But we meddle not with it here, any farther than to assert the fact of grace objectively present in the sacrament under *some* form. Allowing this, there is room still for a difference of view in regard to its precise nature; just as there is room for a similar difference also in regard to the specific power of the Lord's supper. All such difference however comes of right *after* the question, whether there be any such mystic force at all in these solemnities *under any form*. It is with this first general question only, that we have been here concerned. The Baptists, and a large class besides whom we may style Crypto-baptists, as agreeing with them in principle while opposing them in form, most deliberately and distinctly empty the baptismal laver of all mystical sense, see in it only common water, and acknowledge in it no power or force whatever aside from the mental exercises of the baptized subject; which of course turns it into idle mummery as applied to infants. This sweeping and wholesale judgment it is, as it meets us in Mr. Noel's book, that we wish to protest against as unscriptural and false. It is at war with the Bible, with the true idea of the Church, with all Christian antiquity, and with the proper voice of the Reformation. We know that there are great difficulties attending the subject of baptismal grace. But let us not think to escape these, by throwing ourselves into the arms of Rationalism. Whether we can solve them satisfactorily or not, we are still bound, in the way of preliminary faith, to accept the mystery of such grace itself; since the only alternative to this, is to give up the doctrine of the holy sacraments altogether, in the old church sense, and so to bring in another gospel.

J. W. N.

---

#### THE OLD PALATINATE LITURGY OF 1563.

(Continued.)

*Under the impression* that the summary of the Catechism, named in the former article upon this subject, consisted of extracts from the "*Compendium*," attached to some of our English Hymn Books, (as also to those of the Reformed Dutch

Church), it was our intention to pass it by, and proceed at once to a translation of the more devotional portion of the Liturgy. Upon examination however we find, not only that this summary is something different from any thing known to us in English, but that the *Compendium*, hitherto regarded as a translation of that contained in another part of this Liturgy,<sup>1</sup> is something essentially different from this admirable original. Reserving the translation of this old original compendium for its proper place, (in the form of Confirmation), we shall therefore give a specimen of the summary before passing on to the *Second* general division of the Liturgy.

#### BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE CATECHISM.

*What is necessary for man to know in order to be saved?*

Three things: First, how great his sins and misery are. In the next place, how he may be delivered from his misery. *Thirdly*, how he may thank God for such deliverance.

#### I *Of the misery of Man.*

1. *In what does the misery of man consist?*

In his being a poor sinner, and meriting, on account of sin, eternal damnation.

2. *Whence may sin be known?*

Out of the ten commandments of God, which no man can keep, because they require not only an outward, but also an inward perfect obedience of the entire man.

(Here follow the 10 commandments.)

3. *How may we know that we are condemned on account of sin?*

From the curse of God, threatened against all transgressors of the ten commandments, as it is written: Cursed is every one, that continueth not in all things, written in the book of the law, to do them.

4. *But whence comes this misery, that we are such poor sinners?*

From the fall and disobedience of our first parents, Adam and Eve in Paradise.

<sup>1</sup> It constitutes a part of the form of Confirmation. The No. of questions is precisely the same with that of our *Compendium*, and many of them correspond exactly, but others are totally different.

II. *Of man's deliverance.*5. *How are we delivered from this misery?*

God gave His only begotten Son, Jesus Christ, to be our Redeemer and Saviour.

6. *Is there but one God?*

Yes, there is but one only God, yet in three distinct persons, namely, God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, as the articles of our christian faith teach.

*What are these articles of our christian faith?*

(Here the twelve articles of the Apostles' creed are inserted.)

7. *Who is Jesus Christ?*

He is the only-begotten Son of God, and the Son of Mary, as stated in the above articles: that is, He is very God, and very man in one person.

8. *Why had he to be very man?*

That He might suffer death for us.

9. *Why was it necessary for Him to be very God?*

That He might conquer death, and give us eternal life.

10. *From what then hath He delivered us?*

From sin, and all the power of the devil, and from eternal death, so that He hath procured for us, on the other hand, righteousness, the Holy Ghost, and eternal life.

11. *How did He procure this redemption?*

By His sufferings, death, and resurrection.

12. *How are we made partakers of this redemption?*

Alone through true faith.

13. *What is true faith?*

It is a certain assurance and hearty confidence in the promise of God, that for Christ's sake He will be merciful unto us.

15. *Whence may we derive this assured confidence?*

From the promise of the gospel: He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life.

16. *Since then we are made partakers of Christ, and of the redemption He procured for us, by faith alone, of what use are the sacraments?*

They serve to strengthen our faith.

17. *How many sacraments are there in the New Testament?*

Two, holy baptism, and the holy supper of our Lord.

18. *What are the words of the institution of Holy Baptism?*

"Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, he that believeth not shall be damned." This promise is also repeated, where the scrip-

tures call baptism the washing of regeneration, and the purging away of sin.

19. *What are the words of the institution of the Lord's supper?*  
(1. Cor. 11: 23-30 and 1. Cor. 10: 16, are here cited.)

### III. *Of Thankfulness.*

20. *How may a christian show his gratitude to God for his salvation?*

By a christian life, and by believing prayer.

21. *How may christian life be led?*

By doing good works.

22. *What are good works?*

Such as God has enjoined, and are done in true faith, and to the glory of God.

23. *Why are good works necessary?*

Not that we may thereby be saved, but that thus we may prove our gratitude to God, since He hath enjoined them, and they are an evidence of our faith.

24. *How must we show our gratitude to God by prayer?*

By calling upon Him in all times of need, and thanking Him for all His benefits.

25. *But how should we address God in prayer?*

As our Lord Jesus Christ hath taught us: Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name, &c.

Of the "*Scripture passages applicable to every condition in life*," with which this division of the Liturgy closes, it says introductoryly: "The Holy Scriptures not only teach in *general* how we may lead a godly and christian life, but also direct each one, in every particular station, age, and calling, how to conduct himself in the path upon which God has placed him. The most important passages are therefore collected in the following table, that every one may the better know how to conform his conduct to the word of God." This table embraces the following topics, under each of which the passages indicated are quoted in full.

*Of Kings and Princes.*—Deut. 17: 19, 20. Ps. 2: 10, 11.

*Of Councils, Officers, Counsellors, and Judges.*—Ex. 18: 21, 22. 2 Chron. 19: 6, 7.

*Of Subjects.*—Rom. 13: 1, 6.

*Of Preachers, Elders, and Deacons.*—Ezek. 3: 17, 19. Acts. 20: 28. 1 Peter 5: 1, 4. Rom. 12: 7, 8.



*Of hearers.*—Deut. 17: 10, 13. Heb. 13: 17. Coloss. 3: 16, 17. 1 Tim. 5: 17.

*Of Schoolmasters, and Schoolmistresses.*—Mtth. 18: 5, 7. Mark 9: 37.

*Of Scholars.*—Prov. 8: 10, 11. Prov. 12: 1.

*Of married persons in general.*—Heb. 13: 4.

*Of Husbands.*—Eph. 5: 25. Coloss. 3: 19. 1 Peter 3: 7.

*Of Wives.*—Eph. 5: 22, 23, 24. Coloss. 3: 18. 1 Peter 3: 1, 6.

*Of Parents.*—Deut. 6: 6, 7. Prov. 23: 13, 14; 13: 24; 19: 18.

*Of Children.*—Prov. 1: 8, 9. Eph. 6: 1, 3.

*Of Masters and Mistresses.*—Coloss. 4: 1. Eph. 6: 9.

*Of Servants and Handmaids.*—Eph. 6: 5, 8. 1 Peter 2: 18.

*Of the Aged.*—Titus 2: 1, 5.

*Of Youth.*—1 Peter 5: 4, 5. Ps. 119: 9. Isaiah 3: 16, 17.

*Of the Rich.*—1 Tim. 6: 6, 9, 17, 19.

*Of the Poor.*—Prov. 28: 6. James 2: 5.

*General Passages.*—Mtth. 7: 12. John 13: 34, 35.

## II.

### OF PUBLIC PRAYER.

Before the morning sermon, especially on Sabbath, Holy-days, and Fast-days, the following prayer shall be used, in which the christian congregation is emphatically reminded of the misery of man, and the saving grace of God is implored, so that the heart is made humble, and more desirous of the word of grace.

#### *Prayer before Sermon.*

Confession	}	<i>Heavenly Father</i> , eternal and merciful God ;
of sin.		
	}	we acknowledge and confess before Thy divine Majesty that we are poor miserable sinners, conceived and born in sin and corruption, prone to all evil, and unfit for any good. By our sinful life, we have continually transgressed Thy holy commandments, provoked Thy wrath against us, and incurred Thy just judgment unto eternal death. <i>But, O Lord</i> , we re-
Sorrow		
for sin.	}	pent in sorrow that we have thus offended Thee, we condemn ourselves and our iniquities, and implore Thee mercifully to help us in our wretchedness and wo.
1. Prayer for	}	<i>Have mercy</i> upon us, therefore, O most gra-
pardon.		
		cious God and Father, and pardon all our sins, for the sake of the holy sufferings of Thy dear Son, Jesus Christ our Lord.

2. For sanctification. } And vouchsafe unto us, henceforth, the grace of Thy Holy Spirit, that He may teach us heartily to know our unrighteousness, and make us so to abhor ourselves, that sin may be slain in us, and we may arise to newness of life. Thus shall we produce the perfect fruits of holiness and righteousness with which, for Christ's sake, Thou art

3. For a saving apprehension of the word of God. } well pleased. Grant also, that we may rightly understand Thy holy word, according to Thy divine will, that we may learn from thence to withdraw our confidence entirely from the creature, and to put all our trust in Thee. And may our old man, with all its lusts, be daily crucified more and more, that we may present ourselves unto Thee, as living sacrifices, to the honor of Thy holy name, the edification of each other, and the furtherance of our salvation, through our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath also taught us to pray saying :

*Our Father, &c.*

[On Sabbaths after the morning sermon, and especially after the preparatory sermon, the minister shall say :]

*Beloved in the Lord,* Whereas we see in the commandments of God, as in a glass, how great and manifold our sins are, by which we merit temporal and eternal punishment, therefore let each one of us heartily confess the same unto our faithful Father, and sincerely say with me :

Confession of sin before God. } *I poor sinner, acknowledge before Thee, my God and Creator, that I have grievously and in manifold ways, sinned against Thee, not only with gross outward transgressions, but much more with inward natural blindness, unbelief, doubts, despondency, impatience, pride, evil covetousness, secret envy, hatred, malice, and other sinful affections,—as Thou my Lord and God well knowest, and I alas ! cannot deeply enough deplore.—But I repent of these things, and am sorry for them, and heartily beseech Thee for mercy, for the sake of Thy beloved Son, Jesus Christ.—Amen.*

[Then shall the minister declare unto penitent believers the forgiveness of sins, and unto the impenitent the judgment of God, and say :]

*Hearken now* unto the comforting assurance of the grace of God, promised in the gospel to all that believe.

Declaration of Divine Grace to the penitent. } *Thus saith our Lord Jesus Christ,—John 3: 16, For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that all who would believe in Him might not perish, but have everlasting life.*

Unto as many of you therefore, Beloved Brethren, as abhor yourselves and your sins, and believe that you are fully pardoned through the merits of Jesus Christ, and resolve daily more to abstain therefrom and to serve the Lord in true holiness and righteousness, I declare, according to the command of God, that they are released in heaven from all their sins, (as He hath promised in His gospel), through the perfect satisfaction of the most holy passion and death of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The sins of the impenitent retained. } But as there may be some among you, who continue to find pleasure in your sin and shame, or who persist in sin against their conscience, I declare unto such, by the command of God, that the wrath and judgment of God abides upon them, and that all their sins are retained in heaven, and finally that they can never be delivered from eternal damnation, unless they repent.

And inasmuch as we doubt not, but that our prayers are sanctified by the sufferings of Jesus Christ, and therefore acceptable to God, let us heartily call upon Him, and say :

*Our Father, &c.*

*Prayer for Sabbath after the morning Sermon.*

Thanksgiving, for bodily mercies. } Almighty God, Creator of heaven and earth, we give Thee most hearty thanks, that Thou hast created us, and hast preserved, fed and sustained us and our children hitherto, and art still willing to keep and govern us. But especially do we thank Thee, that

2. For spiritual mercies. } Thou has given us to know Thy Son Jesus Christ, and dost pardon our sins for the sake of His bitter passion and death.

PRAYER :  
1. For spiritual mercies promised through the ministry of the word. } We beseech Thee to renew us in the image of Thy Son Jesus Christ, by the preaching of Thy word, and the power of the Holy Ghost, that so we may, both in soul and body live with Thee, to praise Thee, for which we were originally created. Defend us against the malice of Satan, lest he pluck thy holy word out of our hearts, as he did unto our first parents Adam and Eve.

2. For the civil Authority. } And whereas Thou hast ordained civil authorities, by which Thou dost govern us, we beseech Thee, who hast the hearts of rulers in Thy hands, for

\* \* \* \* \*

*Grant* unto our governors grace and peace, that they may direct their authority to that end, that our Lord Jesus Christ, unto Whom all power in heaven and earth is given, may reign over them and their subjects, so that the people, who are the creatures of Thy hands, and the sheep of Thy pasture, and for whom the Lord Jesus shed His blood, may be governed in holiness and righteousness; and that we may, for Thy sake, show unto them all becoming honor and faithfulness, and thus, under their protection, lead an honest, peaceable and christian life.

3. For the fruits of the earth. } *Grant* Thy blessing and favor also upon the fruits of the earth, that we may thus know Thee as our Father, and the fountain of all mercy and blessing. Preserve us also from war, famine, and the swift-

4. For all men. } spreading pestilence. *Neither* pray we for ourselves alone, but for all men in the whole world, that Thou wouldest graciously have compassion upon them.

5. Especially for our persecuted Brethren. } *And especially* for those who have fellowship with us in the Body of Jesus Christ, and who suffer for the truth's sake. Be pleased, O Father of all Grace, to restrain the wrath of Thine enemies, who persecute thy Son Jesus Christ, in His members, and strengthen the persecuted with victorious steadfastness, and the power of Thy Holy Spirit, that they may joyfully receive these sufferings from thy hand, and in the midst of tribulations experience that peace which passeth all understanding.

6. For all afflicted persons. } *Comfort* and sustain the poor, the sick, widows and orphans, all prisoners, and such as are with child, with all troubled and tempted souls, and grant unto them Thy peace, through our Lord Jesus Christ, according to His assured promise: Verily, verily I say unto you, all things that ye shall ask the Father in my name, will He give unto you; and who hath farther instructed us to pray:

*Our Father, &c.*

OR THIS:

Prayer for spiritual and bodily mercies, after the plan of the Lord's prayer, which is briefly explained.

1. Hallowed be Thy name. } *Almighty God, our heavenly Father,* who hast promised certainly to grant unto us those things which we ask for in the name of Thy beloved Son Jesus Christ: we beseech Thee to work in our hearts by Thy Holy Spirit, that we may rightly know Thee, to sanctify, adore and praise Thee in all Thy works, in which Thine Omnipotence, Wisdom, Goodness, Mercy, Justice, and Truth shine forth. Grant also that we



may so order our whole life, all our thoughts, words and works, that Thy name may not be profaned, but adored and praised through us.

2. Thy kingdom } And so govern us, by the sceptre of Thy  
come. } word, and the power of Thy Holy Spirit,  
that we and all men, may daily more subject and yield ourselves  
to Thy Divine Majesty.

*Preserve* and extend Thy Church, and confound all the works of the Devil, and all evil and malicious designs devised against Thy holy word. Put Thine enemies to shame by the might of Thy truth and righteousness, that every power which exalts itself against Thy glory may from day to day be more completely rooted up and destroyed, until the perfection of Thy kingdom shall be consummated, when Thou shalt manifest Thy glory in Thy people at the last day, and be forever all in all.

3. Thy will } *Grant* also, that we and all men may re-  
be done. } nounce our own will, and all the lusts of the  
flesh, and obey, without contradiction, Thy good and perfect will, that each one may as faithfully and cheerfully fulfil his duty and calling, as it is done by the angels in heaven.

4. Our daily } *Provide* for us also, all things needful for our  
bread. } bodies, grant us peace and a wholesome gov-  
ernment, that so we may learn to know Thee as the only foun-  
tain of all good, and our faithful Father, who carest for Thy children, without whose blessing neither anxiety nor labor, nor yet Thy mercies will avail; so that withdrawing all confidence from the creature, we may put our trust in Thee alone.

5. Forgive } *And we beseech Thee*, for the sake of the shed-  
our debts. } ding of Christ's blood, reckon not against us poor  
sinners our iniquities and sins, neither the corruption that still clings to us, inasmuch as we have this evidence of Thy grace in our hearts, that we forgive those that trespass against us, and desire to promote their welfare.

6. Lead us not in- } *In ourselves*, O Lord, we are so weak  
to temptation. } that we cannot maintain our integrity for  
a moment, but are continually exposed to the temptations of our enemies, the devil, the world, and our own flesh. We entreat Thee therefore to preserve and strengthen us, by the power of Thy Holy Spirit, that we may steadfastly withstand these foes, and not be overcome in this spiritual warfare, but remain firm, until we at length obtain the victory, and reign forever in Thy kingdom, with Thy Son, our Lord and Defender Jesus Christ.

7. For Thine is } These things we humbly ask, that thereby  
the kingdom. } not we, but Thou mayest receive eternal

praise. And all this we know Thou canst do for us, since Thou art Almighty God, and art willing to do, for Thou art a faithful Father, as certainly as we sincerely desire them, through our Lord Jesus Christ, Amen.

*Our Father, &c.*

Praise ye the Lord with your song.

[After the singing let the minister say:]

*The Lord bless thee and keep thee: The Lord make His face shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee: The Lord lift up His countenance upon thee, and give thee peace. Amen.*

*Prayer to be used after the Sermon on the Catechism.*

The true God whom  
Christians address  
described.

} *Almighty and only true God, the eternal Father of our Savior Jesus Christ, Thine only begotten Son, together with the Holy Ghost, Creator of heaven and earth, angels, men, and all creatures, Thou art allwise, gracious, righteous, true, pure, merciful, and bounteous.*

Confession and re-  
pentance of sin.

} *I confess alas! that I am a poor sinful man, and heartily repent that I have displeased Thee.*

1. Prayer for  
pardon.

} *But I beseech Thee graciously to pardon all my sins, and clothe me with righteousness, for the sake of Thy well-beloved Son Jesus Christ, who offered Himself a sacrifice for our sins, and died upon the Cross, arose again from the dead, ascended into heaven, and liveth for ever, that through His unspeakable wisdom and mercy, He might be our Mediator, Propitiation, Intercessor and Savior.*

2. For sanctification  
and guidance.

} *Grant also, for His sake, and through Him, more and more to sanctify me, by the Holy Ghost, unto eternal life, and to reign in me, so that I may know Thee the only true God, ever call upon Thee in true faith, serve Thee with hearty obedience, and be kept from falling into sin.*

3. For all condi-  
tions in life.

} *Gather and preserve unto Thyself, in our beloved country, a true holy Church, grant us a happy government, and all needful sustenance, and ever protect us and our poor children, in soul and body. Multiply in them Thy grace, that they may grow up in Christ Thy Son, the Head of the Church, until they attain unto the age of perfect manhood, in all wisdom, holiness and piety.*

Do this, most merciful Lord, for the sake of Thy dear Son, who heareth our sighs, and intercedes for us, through Whom we

believe our supplications are acceptable unto Thee and not made in vain, saying as we do with that humble suppliant of old, Lord I believe, help Thou mine unbelief: Amen.

*Our Father, &c.*

Next to these follow "two prayers to be used after the sermon on working-days," and one for special days of fasting and prayer (of which a very good translation, with a few additions, may be found in the Reformed Dutch Liturgy, under the title "A prayer on the Lord's-day after sermon"), with a second for a similar occasion to be used according to circumstances. But as the insertion of all these would swell this article beyond proper limit, we pass on to give a specimen or two of the prayers appointed for the festival days of the Church.

*Prayer for Christmas, after the Sermon.*

THANKSGIVING	}	Eternal, and Almighty God, we give Thee
1. For the plan of redemption.		most hearty thanks, that in Thy great love, Thou didst graciously pity us, who were doomed to eternal death for our sins, and ordained Thine only begotten Son, before the foundation of the world was laid, to be our
2. The promise.		Mediator, Atonement, and Savior; that He was promised unto our first parents in paradise, after their deplorable fall, and at the appointed time was
3. His mission and incarnation.		sent into the world, that He assumed our flesh and blood, became our Brother, and in all things like unto us, sin excepted. We praise Thee, that by His death He destroyed him who had the power of death, the Devil,
4. The redemption He effected.	}	and delivered us, who must otherwise have spent our whole life in bondage to the fear of death, from the thralldom of Satan and darkness, and translated as into the kingdom of light and eternal happiness.
1. Prayer for the saving knowledge of Jesus Christ.	}	We heartily beseech Thee to fill us with Thy grace, that we may rightly know this Thy love and mercy, and Jesus Christ Thy Son, Whom Thou hast made unto us for wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption, and so love and honor Him, as wholly to surrender ourselves up unto Him, to confide in Him, and esteem everything in the world as dross and dung, for the excellency of the knowledge of Jesus Christ. And may we cling unto this Savior with true faith, who forgiveth all our sins, and healeth all our diseases, that we may rejoice in all the tribu-

lations of this life, and sing with the heavenly host : Glory to God in the highest peace on earth, and good-will toward men ! and finally attain unto the end of our faith, even the salvation of our souls.

2. For the civil government. } We entreat Thee also for all the govern-  
ments of the world, for \* \* \* \*

\* \* Grant unto our Rulers grace and peace, that they govern those placed under them in Thy fear, and with Thine approbation, that righteousness may be promoted, and iniquity be checked and punished, that we may fulfil our days in quietness and peace, as becometh christians.

3. For feeble and troubled souls. } Confirm all weak and disconsolate spirits, and send down upon us Thy peace, through Jesus Christ our Lord, who hath taught us to pray :

*Our Father, &c.*

[The prayers for Newyears-day and Good-Friday, which next follow we omit.]

*Prayer for Easter-day, after the Sermon.*

Almighty and most merciful God, we render Thee praise and thanksgiving, that Thou gavest Thy dear Son Jesus Christ, to die for our sins, and rise again for our justification, to overcome for us all our enemies, death, sin, the world, and the Devil, and restore unto us righteousness and life. We beseech Thee by the power of Thy Holy Spirit, to awake us more and more from the death of sin, unto newness of life, that we may rightly experience in our own souls the power of the resurrection of Christ Jesus, and be each day more completely incorporated into Him, until finally our mortal bodies shall be waked up from the dust of the earth, reunited with their spirits, be made like unto His glorious Body, and dwell forever with Him in eternal joy and glory.

Grant Thy blessing also unto the preaching of Thy holy gospel ; destroy all the works of the Devil ; and strengthen all the ministers of Thy Church, and Rulers of Thy people. Wherefore we also pray for \* \* \* \*

[The closing paragraphs of this prayer are the same as the above.]

*Our Father, &c.*

Passing by the prayer for Ascension-day which is next in order, we shall conclude these translated extracts with the



*Prayer for Whitsuntide, after the Sermon.*

Our heavenly Father, inasmuch as Thou hast so loved us, as to give Thine only-begotten Son to be our Savior and Mediator, but we wretched sinners are nevertheless unable rightly to know Him whom Thou hast sent or truly to call Him our Lord, without the help of Thy Holy Spirit; we beseech Thee, according to Thy promise, richly to pour out upon Thy servants and hand-maidens, Thy Holy Spirit, that He may lead us into all truth, increase and confirm in us true faith, renew our hearts more and more unto a hope of eternal life, and kindle in us ardent love, the spirit of fervent prayer and confidence, peace and joy of heart and conscience, steadfast and ever enduring consolation, together with all gladness and assurance of soul, and so seal us unto the day of our final redemption, when Thou shalt be all and in all.

Clothe the Servants and Rulers of Thy people also with strength, that they may preach Thy word in faithfulness and with perseverance, and handle the sword of civil authority with justice and temperance.

Wherefore we entreat Thee on behalf of \* \* \* \* \*

Defend us against all deceit and treachery, and confound the evil and malicious counsels which may be devised against Thy word and Church.

O Lord, take not Thy Holy Spirit from us, withdraw not Thy saving word, but imbue us with true faith, patience, and steadfastness. Awake to the help of Thy Church, and deliver her from all oppression, contempt and tyranny. Confirm all feeble and sorrowing Spirits, send them and us Thy peace, through Jesus Christ our Lord, who hath given us this assurance: Verily, verily I say unto you, whatsoever, &c.

*Our Father, &c.*

This part of the Liturgy concludes with two daily prayers, for the appointed morning and evening devotions.

Several remarks, suggested by these good old prayers, are reserved for another opportunity.

## III.

## OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE HOLY SACRAMENTS.

*Of Holy Baptism.*

Grounds of infant baptism. }

*Whereas the children of believers are included in the covenant of God (Acts. 2: 38),*

they shall also be partakers of holy Baptism, as the sign and seal of that covenant, and thus be distinguished from the children of unbelievers. Besides it is certain, that children, as well as adults, may receive the Holy Spirit, Who plants faith in the heart; for if any have not the Spirit of Christ, saith the Apostle, he is not his.

But nothing can prevent those, who have the Spirit of God, from being baptized, as is written in Acts. 10: 47. Children moreover are by no means the smallest portion of the Christian Church, which Church with all its members is redeemed by the blood of Christ, and purged by the baptism of the Word. For these and other reasons it is clear, that young children are by no means to be excluded from Baptism.

Preachers of the  
word alone to  
baptize.

} *Of the persons* who are to baptize, our Lord hath given us this commandment in the last chapter of Matthew: Go ye into all the world, teaching all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them all things whatsoever I have commanded you. In these words the Lord enjoins it upon those alone to baptize, who are called to preach His holy word, and so includes preaching and baptizing in one command and office. Wherefore it is not proper that any one should sunder this command, and commit the office of Baptism, to a person who is forbidden to preach.

Baptism shall be  
administered in the  
Church after the  
Sermon.

} Whenever therefore it is requested in a becoming way on behalf of children, and they are brought into the Church to the ministers of the Word, they shall baptize them. This shall be done especially on Sabbaths, or Holy-days, or otherwise at public week-day service, after the sermon, in presence of the congregation, so that every one may be reminded of his own baptism, and they may unitedly call upon the name of the Lord on behalf of the child.

It shall be the duty of the father of the child, or in his absence, of one of his nearest friends, to apply to the Minister for baptism, and to inform him who are to be the Sponsors, before they have engaged, so that he may not only know who they are to be, but that in case there should be any unfitness in them (viz, either the father or sponsor) he may have an opportunity of previous conversation with them.

In this matter special care shall be had, that none but worthy and godly persons be invited and permitted to present themselves, and by no means frivolous persons, who know and care but little for the christian religion, such as are mere Epicureans, or given

to open vices, nor such as, either on account of their youth or ignorance, are unacquainted with the christian doctrine; but let such be admitted as know and understand at least the principal points of the Catechism, so that the holy sacrament of Baptism may not be profaned by the ignorance or unworthiness of the sponsor, neither the child be neglected by such in its christian instruction and nurture.

At the same time however Baptism should not be delayed, either through contempt, or erroneous views, or other causes; neither should the trifling dainties prepared for the occasion, lead to the assemblage or admission of an undue number of persons to the Baptism.

Furthermore, the father of the child, shall attend to its baptism—for the following reasons: First, that he may thank God, for his own creation and that of his child, and for the redemption purchased by the blood of Jesus Christ, which is sealed unto the child in holy Baptism, and call upon God for grace to train up the child to His praise and glory.

Then, that the Minister may record the name of the father, mother, and sponsors, in the book which every Church shall procure and keep for that purpose.

And should a child be illegitimately born, whose father's name may not be known at the time, the name of the Mother, the Sponsors and the Child shall be recorded, the child be baptized, and thereupon the proper authority be informed of the case, that suitable christian discipline may be exercised upon it.

---

#### FORM OF BAPTISM.

Ps. 121: 2. } Our help is in the name of the Lord, who  
 " 124: 8. } made heaven and earth. Amen.

John, } Our Lord Jesus Christ hath said, except a man be  
 3: 3, 5. } born again, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven. He thus clearly signifies to us that our nature is totally

Our misery. } depraved, and accursed and exhorts us therefore  
 } to humble and abhor ourselves before God; and  
 thus prepares us to desire His grace, by which all the guilt and condemnation of our old nature may be removed. For we are not capable of receiving the grace of God, unless all confidence in our own strength, wisdom and righteousness be first eradicated from our hearts, and we be led totally to condemn ourselves.

Comfort and } But after that Christ hath thus placed our  
 redemption. } misery before our eyes, He also comforteth us

through His mercy, by promising to us and our children, that He will wash us clean from all our sins, that is that on account of the shedding of His blood, they shall not be imputed to us, but that our natures shall be renewed in His image, by His holy Spirit. And in order to confirm this promise to our weak faith, and to seal it upon our own bodies, He hath commanded that

Math. } we should be baptized in the name of the Father, of  
28: 19 } the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

The engagement } *Wherefore in the first place, since He*  
of God to us in bap- } commands us to be baptized with water in  
tism Gen. 17: 2, 3, } the name of the Father, He assures us, as  
with a visible oath, during our whole life, that God shall be our  
Father, and the Father of our children, that He will provide for  
us all things necessary for body and soul, and make all things  
work together for our good, (since, by reason of the covenant in  
which we stand with God, nothing can harm us, but must rather  
subserve our salvation.)

*In the next place, whereas we are baptized in the name of the Son, He promiseth unto us that all things done and suffered by the Son of God shall be ours, that He will be our Saviour, and the Saviour of our children, and graciously redeem us from all our corruption and sins, by His holy anointing, conception birth, sufferings, and death. (And also, that the curse and condemnation of our sins were nailed to His cross, purged away with His blood, and buried with Him in the sepulchre, so that He hath freed us from the pains of hell, by His resurrection and ascension clothed us with His righteousness, and is our advocate with the Father, and in the last day will present us unto Him glorious and without spot.) Thirdly, since we are baptized in the name of the Holy Ghost, we are assured that the Holy Ghost will be the Teacher and Comforter of us and our children to all eternity, and make us true members of the body of Christ. (And further that we have fellowship with all His benefits in common with all the members of His Church, so that our sins shall be remembered no more forever, and that the corruptions and infirmities, that still cling to us may be continually mortified and a new life be commenced, which finally in the resurrection, (when our body shall be made like unto the glorious body of Christ,) shall be completely revealed in us.)*

Our obligations } *But as in every covenant two parties are*  
in baptism. } obligated, we, on our part, promise unto God  
the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, that by His grace we will acknowledge and confess Him alone, as the only true and living God, flee to Him alone in every distress, and show ourselves



obedient children, as is required by our regeneration, which consists in these two points: (First, that in true repentance and sorrow for our sins, we deny ourselves and our lusts, and subject our mind and will to that of God, that we heartily abhor and forsake our sins; and secondly, that we begin with delight and love to live in all holiness and righteousness according to the word of God.)

Comfort under surprisals of sin. } And should we sometimes fall into sin through infirmity, we must not continue therein, or despair, or seek forgiveness by any other means excepting through Jesus Christ, but ever be reminded by our baptism of our duty to abstain therefrom, and firmly to believe that for the sake of the shedding of the blood of Christ God will no more remember it: (inasmuch, as Holy Baptism is an undoubted witness, that we stand in an everlasting covenant with God, and that we are baptized in the living fountain of the eternal mercy of the Father, and the most holy passion and death of Jesus Christ, by the power of the Holy Ghost.)

Grounds of infant baptism. } And although our young children do not understand these reasons, or this mystery, and are much less capable of confessing the same, they are nevertheless not to be excluded from Holy Baptism; for they are called unto the divine covenant, which God made with Abraham, the father of all the faithful, and to his seed, and also with us and our children. "I will," saith the Lord (Gen. 17: 7), "establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant; to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee."

Now our Lord Jesus Christ came into the world, not to diminish the grace of God, but rather to extend the covenant of grace in which the people of Israel were previously included over the whole earth, and hath appointed Baptism in the place of circumcision, as a sign and seal of this covenant unto us and our children. The Apostle Peter expressly teaches this confirmation of the covenant in Acts. 2: 39—"Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call."

Moreover our Lord Jesus Christ himself commands them to bring their infants unto Him, and assures them, by word and deed, of the kingdom of heaven, as it is written (Mark, 10: 13, 14): "And they brought young children unto Him, that he should touch them; and His disciples rebuked those that brought them."

But when Jesus saw it, he was much displeased, and said unto them, suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein. And He embraced them, and laid His hands upon them and blessed them."

From all this it is evident, that our children are also included in the kingdom and covenant of God, and should therefore receive Baptism, as a seal of the covenant, although they may not understand its holy mysteries; even as those infants were blessed by Jesus Christ, in word and deed, and in the Jewish Church children were circumcised on the eighth day; although neither the one nor the other was understood by them.

Wherefore let us call upon God and say:—

Almighty and eternal God, we beseech Thee, of Thine infinite mercy, graciously to regard this child (or, these children), and by Thy Holy Spirit to incorporate it with Thy Son Jesus Christ, that it may be buried with Him in His death, and also arise with Him to newness of life, by cheerfully bearing His cross, and following Him daily, and cleaving unto him in true faith, firm hope, and ardent love, that it may for Thy sake gladly forsake this present life, which is nothing but death, and appear in the last day without terror, before the judgment seat of Jesus Christ Thy Son, who, with Thee and the Holy Ghost, one God, lives and reigns forever Amen.

*Our Father, &c.*

Confess therefore with me, the articles of our old, universal undoubted, Christian faith, into which this child (or children) shall be baptized:

I believe in God, the Father Almighty, &c., &c.

#### *Questions to the Sponsors.*

Do you desire, in true faith in the promise of God in Christ, given to us and our children, that He will not only be our God, but the God of our children, unto the thousandth generation, that this child (or these children), may be baptized into the same and receive the seal of Divine adoption? Then answer Yea.

(It is not necessary, here to remove the garments of the child but merely to uncover its head.

Then the minister shall call upon them to name the child, and thereupon sprinkle it with water, and say:)

N.—I baptize thee in the name of God, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, Amen.

*Thanksgiving.*

Let us thank the Lord our God.

Almighty and most merciful God and Father, we render Thee praise and thanksgiving, that Thou forgivest us and our children all our sins, through the blood of Thy dear Son, and hast received us, by the Holy Spirit, as members of Thine only begotten Son, and therefore as Thy children, sealing and confirming this grace unto us in Holy Baptism. We pray Thee therefore, for His sake, evermore to govern this child by Thy Holy Spirit. Cause it to be trained in a christian and godly manner, to grow in the Lord Jesus Christ, and increase in His knowledge; that it may acknowledge Thy Fatherly goodness and mercy which Thou hast displayed unto it, and us all, and live in all righteousness under our only Prophet, Priest, and King Jesus Christ, courageously contending and prevailing against sin, the devil and his entire kingdom; and thus may it forever praise and glorify Thee, and Thy dear Son Jesus Christ together with the Holy Ghost, the only true God. Amen.

*Address.*

Beloved in the Lord Jesus Christ, inasmuch as you have assumed the care of this child, remember that our God is a faithful God, and requires us to serve Him in truth. Wherefore you who are the friends and relatives of this child, but especially ye parents and sponsors, should use all diligence, that this child, when it reaches years of understanding, be rightly instructed in the proper knowledge and fear of God, according to the articles of our christian faith, revealed by God from heaven and contained in the Old and New Testaments; that it be trained up in the Lord Jesus Christ, and admonished, that by the reception of the sign and seal of this divine covenant, in Baptism, it renounced the devil and the world, with all their works and lusts, and surrendered and pledged itself unto the Lord, to be His through life in all holiness, and obediently to serve His holy gospel. And may the eternal Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, grant you grace to do this. Amen.

The Lord bless you, and keep you, &c.

*OF PREPARATION FOR THE HOLY SUPPER OF OUR LORD.*

The Lord's Supper shall be administered in the larger towns at least once in two months, in other places four times each

year, viz: on Christmas, Easterday, Whitsuntide, and on the first Sabbath in September. Yet as the edification, custom, or want of the Church may require it, it is proper to administer it more frequently.

Whenever it is designed to administer this sacrament, notice thereof shall be given by the minister to the congregation, a week before, with an exhortation to preparation for it. He shall also admonish parents and heads of families, that they meanwhile aid and instruct their children or youth, whom they may intend for the first time to bring to the table of the Lord, and present them on the following Saturday, or some other suitable day, to the minister, that they may make confession of their faith and if it be necessary, receive further instruction and admonition from him.

Thereupon the minister shall ask those who thus present themselves, to repeat, first, the articles of our christian faith, the ten commandments, and the Lord's prayer, and next interrogate them from the Catechism upon the Lord's supper. But as some may not be able, through bashfulness, to rehearse those points as perfectly as others, yet if they appear sufficiently to understand them, and are otherwise not unworthy, the minister shall carefully remind them of the principal articles of faith, and especially of the design and proper use of the Lord's supper as well as of the necessity of due preparation for it, and of faithful self examination, and then after they have made profession they shall be admitted with the congregation, to the supper of the Lord. And should there be any others in the congregation, who never before communed, desirous of so doing, they shall likewise give the minister previous notice thereof and make confession of their faith.

On the day before the administration of the supper, after the conclusion of the preparatory sermon, (as previously directed to be held), the minister shall request the people to remain, and gather around the table, to receive further instructions, and make confession of their repentance and faith. He shall then come down from the pulpit, and standing before the table, shall read the following form of preparation with a clear and distinct voice.

#### *Form of Preparation.*

1. Confession of our misery. } The word of God holds forth for our special consideration these three points, *first*, our sins, *secondly* our redemption, and *thirdly* the gratitude we owe unto God for our redemption. Let each one therefore con-



sider the sum of the commandments of God, viz, thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, with all thy mind, and with all thy strength, and thy neighbor as thyself, in which the whole will of God is set before us. And since we have never fulfilled these commandments, they show us, as in a glass, our sins and miseries, and finally the eternal damnation to which we are exposed. Wherefore I ask you, in the first place, whether you confess these sins with me before the face of God, and abhor yourselves on account of them, and thirst after the righteousness and grace of Jesus Christ?

In the next place, do you believe that God is not only merciful, but also just, and will not suffer  
 2. Confession of faith }  
 in the promise of the } sin to go unpunished, and (since no  
 gospel. } mere creatures could have endured such  
 punishment for us) that the only Son of God, through the mercy of the Father, was sent into the world, assumed a true human body and soul, so that he might bear for us in the same, viz, our flesh and blood, the punishment and wrath of God, which we had merited; and further, that according to the certain promise of the gospel, this perfect satisfaction of the Son of God for our sins, is granted especially to every one who accepts thereof with hearty confidence, and that every one shall receive the forgiveness of his sins, as surely as if he never had committed any, and is thenceforth considered as holy and righteous before God, as though he had fulfilled all that righteousness in himself, which Jesus Christ his Saviour accomplished for him, and bestowed upon him without any personal merit, wholly of grace, notwithstanding his unworthiness thereof, and the many infirmities that still cleave unto him, because these are all covered by the passion and obedience of Jesus Christ, until finally they shall be forever removed.

And furthermore, do you also believe, that Jesus Christ will confirm in every one of you, this redemption, once promised and granted in holy Baptism, by His holy Supper, as by certain letters and signs, through the operation of the Holy Ghost, assuring you first, that His body was as certainly offered for you upon the cross, and His blood shed for you, as you see with your natural eyes, the bread, which He calls his body, broken for you, and the cup of thanksgiving offered unto you. And in the next place, that the Lord Jesus Himself will as certainly feed and refresh your hungering and contrite heart, and weary soul, with His crucified body, and shed blood, by the Holy Ghost, as you receive from the hand of the minister, and orally eat and drink of the consecrated bread, and chalice of the Lord, in remem-

brance of Him; and that therefore the passion and death of Jesus Christ is as certainly your own as if you had endured all in your own body, that the Lord suffered in His sacred body for you; and that in order to secure to us this comfort, the Lord Jesus instituted His holy supper, that we might celebrate it with gratitude and joy, until He shall come in the clouds, and fully deliver us from the cross, under which we must patiently follow Him through this valley of tears, and receive us, soul and body, unto Himself in the everlasting kingdom of His Father. Is this your faith? Then

*Answer—Yea.*

In the third place, let every one examine his heart to know  
 3. Exhortation to } whether he truly desires to prove himself  
 firmness of pur- } thankful to the Lord Jesus, for the rest of  
 pose, and amend- } his life; whether also, you heartily renounce  
 ment of life. } all envy, malice, and bitterness, forgiving

your neighbors as the Lord Jesus has many thousand times forgiven us poor sinners. Whether you resolve as in God's presence heartily to hate all profanity, sinful words, and works, gluttony, drunkenness, and all other sins, so that you may, by the grace of God, nevermore, in your whole life, commit the same? Is this your firm christian purpose?

*Answer—Yea.*

All therefore who find this faith, and these purposes in their hearts, must not doubt that they already possess and certainly receive the pardon of all their sins, through the holy passion and death of Jesus Christ, as long as they persevere in these purposes, notwithstanding the many infirmities that may still remain in them, but which are covered with the righteousness and death of Jesus Christ. Wherefore let every one who heartily desires this, say with me—Amen.

(For the confession and absolution of sins see above.)

Let us now pray as the Lord hath taught us:

*Our Father, &c.*

After this prayer the minister shall say:

The very God of peace sanctify you wholly: and I pray God, your whole spirit and soul and body, be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. Faithful is He that calleth you, who also will do it.—Amen.

(Should any person have some special matter upon his mind, in reference to which he may desire to speak with the minister, an opportunity of so doing should by all means be afforded.)

*Easton, Pa.*

J. H. A. B.

CORRECTION.—On page 92, Jan. No., the name *Isaac* should read *Isaiah*.

## OVIDIUS NASO REDIVIVUS.

I do not know when I have been better pleased than I was lately on entering into the the school-room of my friend E. S. to observe, seated at recitation, a whole class with one of them standing up and reading aloud, *ore rotundo*, in broad day-light, from the *Metamorphoses* of Publius Ovidius Naso. Under the quiet, abiding impression had I come into this room that this Latin classic, some time since, had been removed from his literary office, as being a worse than useless manual; that to satisfy the public wrath, which against him had been roused by some over-zealous reformers, on account of his somewhat suspicious morals and occasional lightness, as they said, our teachers had some years-ago, been induced to expel him from their schools; so that as a class-book, to all intents and purposes, he was now morally defunct. As, at the same time, some others of our best ancient classics, by these same reformers, were threatened with a similar overthrow, trusting that with one victim their vengeance would be satiated, and fearing lest their mood might not be pacified but chafed by any remonstrance, I had felt, no doubt, with others of his friends, on the occasion, disposed to pass over in submissive silence this sudden, untimely removal of our Ovid. Amid surrounding storms I was willing that this unfortunate Jonah, much as I loved him, should be thrown overboard, if thereby would be calmed the waves of discontent and preserved the remaining heroes and wealth of the argosy. On entering into this school room then, under this settled impression, how great was my amazement to hear again the words of my long-lost friend! Ovidius Naso *redivivus*! To see copies of his book held forth by a whole class of aspiring young scholars as their treasured vade-mecum! Not of Arion in the courts of Perianther was the appearance more unexpected. Not of John Barleycorn, in summer livery, the standing up again, who had been ploughed down, was to me an event more joyous. From the proffered hand of an obliging, tender stripling how eagerly did I pluck one of these volumes! A well gotten up copy it was, edited by N. C. Brooks, A. M., including, of the *Metamorphoses*, my joy was a little abated to observe, only four books, but explained throughout by appropriate English notes and set off by pictorial embellishments.

After your common prints I would, by no means, have it supposed that I am apt to be drawn away in gaping admiration. On the contrary, I must say that, in most cases, I am rather chagrined at having my solid reading interrupted by a wood-cut on

every page. Poetry and pictures served up to me in equal proportions in a book are generally not gratifying to my taste. Embellishments of this sort, I feel persuaded, should come in a volume, "like angel's visits, few and far between," and like angels themselves, impressed always with the divine stamp of genius. In the best and longest poems only a few rare passages are seized upon by the inspired artist as proper subjects for his pencil; but on these he bestows all his phrensy. By brooding over these his imagination calls forth pictures well worthy of being studied, and such as are really ornaments to the books in which they are placed. Still, to the illustrators of the ancient classics greater freedom is to be allowed. In such books, even many engravings interspersed, if well designed, are not annoying, but highly gratifying to the student; as on the text they prove often to be the best commentaries, especially when illustrative of ancient manners and customs. Who, for instance, in this way, has not been aided and pleased by the classical designs of Flaxman in Homer's *Iliad*? Who does not remember with fondness and gratitude the treasured pictures in his old Virgil? In a book like the present too they are peculiarly appropriate. The *Metamorphoses* of Ovid, as well stated by the editor of this edition, form the most suitable introduction to heathen mythology; and with this essential part of a good education, to make the student familiar, many pictorial designs are absolutely indispensable.

In two or three of these embellishments, however, it struck me that the artist had not fixed upon the happiest moment for presentation. To describe motion or changes in bodies comes not properly under the art of painting. Her scenes may be more actual and vivid, to be sure, being addressed to the eye, than those of poetry, which are addressed to the imagination; but with her sister art she cannot move along, hand in hand, in time. Her figures are immovable and forever confined to a single instant. It is cruel then, I would think, in any artist to seize upon a poor, unfortunate individual, only half transformed, and hold him up to the public gaze forever fixed in this awful plight without any hope of a consummation. A more incongruous monster is in this way produced than is that smiled at by Horace in the beginning of his *Art of Poetry*. The *Midsummer Night's Dream* of Shakespeare, as well remarked by Hazlitt, is not adapted for scenic representation. Pleasing as its fancies are to the private reader or the social circle they lose half their interest in being shown as actual things on the stage. The imagination then can no longer delight itself with its own unreal phantasmas. "Bottom's head in the play," says this excellent critic,



"is a fantastic illusion produced by magic spells; on the stage it is an ass's head and nothing more; certainly a very strange costume for a gentleman to appear in. Fancy cannot be embodied any more than a simile can be painted; and it is as idle to attempt it as to personate *Wall* or *Moonshine*." If by scenic representation then this sort of poetry is injured much more must it be by pictorial delineations; which, while they present the same actual objects to the sight, are yet not relieved by the novelty of continual change and progress. How absurd then for an artist, in illustrating the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid, to show us *Lycaon* wearing the head of a wolf, *Actæon* that of a stag, and, worse than all, *Ocyrrhoe* that of a mare! Less wonderful, to be sure, but certainly more seemly, would their figures have appeared had they been presented to us either immediately before or immediately after their metamorphoses. With how much better taste are *Daphne* and *Syrinx* exhibited, each at the water's brink, and *Narcissus*, hanging over the brook, without, as yet, a single, incipient, vegetable sprout showing itself from their devoted bodies!

Into his notes, I was pleased to observe that the editor had thrown many choice passages from both ancient and modern authors. These, as in his preface he tells us, not only to illustrate the text, has he introduced, but to excite besides in the young scholar a taste for general literature. What a pity it is that the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid if read at all, are generally handled by the student at a time, when, it is to be presumed, he has as yet made but little advancement in Greek! On this account it is, no doubt, that of the quotations from this language the annotator has given us, for the most part, only translations by modern writers and these not always the most literal. Citations from the ancients too are brought in mostly to explain merely the text or some ancient customs; whereas a modern passage is often lugged in, I am sorry to say it, for little more than to display its beauty. Besides this, though I know the editor is a warm admirer of the ancients, yet he sometimes alarms my fears lest by some of his notes introducing modern verses he may induce the unwary student to surmise that perhaps, after all, the merits of these old classics have been over-rated. While setting forth some choice gem of later poets which, he says, surpasses anything, at any rate, of the same sort, in the old books, I am apprehensive lest he should mislead the young sciolist to infer, from this one instance, perhaps itself over-estimated, a general conclusion, and set it down that, in all its departments, modern poetry is superior. While remarking, for instance, on *Daph-*

ne's "sideribus similes oculos," on account of this apprehension, I had been just as well pleased had he refrained from passing on Moore that high encomium, on the occasion, which he doth, saying that, although by many former poets these sublunary orbs of female beauty had been compared to those in the heavens, yet for this modern bard it had been reserved to describe the human brilliants as surpassing those above.

"Look out upon the stars, my love,  
And *shame* them with thine eyes."

Again, when poor Ovid, in the simplicity of his heart, while depicting the morning, setteth forth Aurora as the principal figure, which any Greek or Roman poet could not have helped doing, our annotator remarks, I fear exultingly: "The following description of morning by a modern poet far transcends the ancient." Whereupon he gives us some lines from N. P. Willis.

Now, in descriptive poetry, I am willing to admit that the ancients are inferior to the moderns. To depict natural scenery after the plain manner of landscape painting the old Greek and Latin poets were not very ambitious. They issued no such poems as Cowper's *Task* or Thomson's *Seasons*, charming as these properly are to a modern ear. In the whole range of Grecian Literature (though that of the Romans is not quite so fruitless) only two or three very brief sketches of this sort are to be met with. But was this owing in them to any want of imagination or love for what is beautiful or romantic in nature? I trow not. It was because, of their respective countries with the bewitching sceneries they were so enamoured that, with describing their mere outward show, they were not satisfied, but they wished, by their creative imaginations, to seize upon the inmost spirits of these and bring them forth embodied into day. That around the objects of nature their warm affections might cling more fondly, to render these, in the first place, more congenial and captivating by assimilation, they personified their beauties. In every clear and secluded fountain they spied lurking a white Naiad; amid the rustling leaves of an old oak they heard faintly uttered the sweet voice of a pensive Hamadryad; and while rambling in the remote glens of the mountains they sometimes came suddenly upon a frolicking, wild Oread; or from underneath the laughing forest-trees of June they startled up at times a whole set of dancing Fawns or Satyrs. No wonder then that, in the morning, they were not content with depicting the mere

drapery of the clouds or the dew-besprent foliage, even with the most beautiful imagery, without making any mention of Aurora herself, whom they saw ascending into her golden chariot drawn by pale-red horses, herself arrayed in saffron colored robes, having just arisen from the gloomy bed of old Tithonus.

Nevertheless, to say nothing of their Epos and dramatic and lyric poetry, in which we all know their excellence, even in description of natural scenery, when accompanied with narrative and human incident, they are seldom surpassed. Of this sort some beautiful passages occur in the *Metamorphoses* themselves and in other Latin works, but the finest, it must be said, are to be met with in the old Greek poets. The Latin language, we know, is admirably adapted for lofty themes, but it is too dignified and cumbersome withal for setting off to advantage the playful or the picturesque. The Greek, on the contrary, flexible and copious, with its various dialects, is suited for all subjects. Of such close application was it susceptible and so perspicuous could it be rendered by the true ancient poets that their images could be shown through it almost palpable and naked, and as captivating to the senses as were the breathing statues of their equally inspired brothers, the artists. Take, for instance, the picture of Hylas and the water-nymphs as set forth by Theocritus. For Hercules waiting on a verdant, rushy spot, amid his argonautic companions, on the unexplored coast of Mysia just landed, being about to partake of their evening meal, the lad has gone forth to fetch some water, when presently he cometh upon a well:

Τ'ΑΧΑ δὲ κράναν ἐνόησεν

Ἡμένω ἐν χώρῳ· περί δὲ θρία πολλὰ πεφύκη,  
Κνάνεόν τε χελιδόνιον, χλοερόν τ' ἀδιάντον,  
Καὶ δάλλοντα σέλινα, καὶ εἰλιτενῆς ἀγρωστίας·  
Ἵδατι δ' ἐν μέσσω Νύμφαι χορὸν ἀρτίζοντο,  
Νύμφαι ἀχοίμητοι, δειναὶ θεαὶ ἀγροιώταις,  
Εὐνείχα καὶ Μαλὶς, Ἰαρ δ' ὀρώσα Νυχτιά.  
Ἦτοι ὁ κῶρος ἐπεῖχε ποτῶ πολυχανδέα κρωσσόν,  
Βάψαι ἐπειγομενος· ταὶ δ' ἐν χερὶ πᾶσαι ἔφυσαι·  
Πασάων γὰρ ἔριος ἀπαλὰς φρένας ἀμφεκάλυψεν  
Ἀργεῖφ ἐπὶ παιδὶ· κατήριπε δ' ἐς μέλαν ὕδωρ  
Ἀδρός, ὡς ὅσα πυρρὸς ἀπ' οὐρανῷ ἤριπεν αὐτῇρ  
Ἀδρός ἐν ποντῶ.

“And straight he was aware  
Of water in a hollow place, low down,

Where the thick sward shone with blue calandine,  
 And bright green maiden-hair, still dry in dew,  
 And parsely rich. And at that hour it chanced  
 The nymphs unseen were dancing in the fount—  
 The sleepless nymphs, revered of houring men;  
 Winning Eunica; Malis apple-checked;  
 And, like a night-bedewed rose, Nichéa.  
 Down stepp'd the boy, in haste to give his urn  
 Its fill, and push'd it in the fount; when, lo!  
 Fair hands were on him—fair and very fast;  
 For all the gentle souls that haunted there  
 Were drawn in love's sweet yearning tow'rd the boy;  
 And so he dropp'd within the darksome well—  
 Dropp'd like a star, that, on a summer eve,  
 Slides in ethereal beauty to the sea."

The reader will remark, in the Greek, how admirably the closing line, all dactyls save the last and no cesura, describes the gliding of a star, hastened seemingly by slight, repeated impulses, but without any pause on its way until at last it drops into the deep. He will observe too that the translation of the whole, which is by Leigh Hunt, catches all its simplicity and beauty from its being a somewhat close rendering of the original.

Though against Ovid prejudices may thereby be again excited, as being an old heathen, and it may be at the risque of bringing about his second downfall, yet I cannot help remarking that I think his editor is disposed to refer too many of his mythological heroes to a scriptural origin. From the sacred record of the cosmogony and the deluge as given by Moses that the profane accounts of the creation and Deucalion's flood may have been partially derived in a traditionary way I am willing to allow; but in his zeal to uphold the good fame of Ovid and his fables our interpreter, it strikes me, is sometimes carried away too far in tracing out resemblances. With many of his scriptural quotations in other places, as they serve, if nothing more, to call the student's attention to the high literary merits of the volume from which they have been drawn, I am certainly well pleased; but unless to aid in establishing the authenticity of this divine book itself, which certainly stands in need of no such corroborations, I can see no great advantage to be gained in representing as many as possible of the heathen fables, at any rate, if their descent is somewhat doubtful, as being only corrupt traditions of Biblical truths. With respect then to the editor's opinion that the divinity of Bacchus is a mere blending together of the persons and histories of Adam and Noah, notwithstanding his being supported in it by some eminent critics and com-



mentators, I must own that I am still somewhat skeptical. That Bacchus is styled, in the Orphic hymns the *First born* or *First-become* (Πρωτόγονος) is not to be denied, and many other mystic names besides; but these, I would think, were ascribed to him on account of his having been regarded by his worshippers as the emblematic deification of the great productive principle in nature, and certainly not, as our annotator would persuade us, from his having been identical with Adam. Noah was carried in a ship and so was Bacchus; Noah became afterwards a husbandman and planted a vineyard and so did Bacchus; but it would require a great number of such coincidences in their biographies, to be sure, to show these heroes identical. Of the titles *Liber* and *Lyceus* or *Lysius* applied to Bacchus, the one derived from *libare*, to pour out, and the other from λύνειν, to set free, because wine is poured out and setteth free the heart of man from cares, our commentator, with the common acceptations, is not well satisfied, but underneath each of these appellations he discovereth the signification of *rest* or *comfort*, which is contained also in the word Noah. In this way, from the many names of Bacchus, (πολυώνυμος he hath well been styled) a sameness might easily be made out, we would think, between the god of wine and almost any other illustrious hero. The impetuous rushing of the Bacchæ in their mystic rites, with hair disheveled and frantic gesticulations, he fancies was in imitation of Eve when she fled wildly from the gates of Paradise; and their cry *Evoë!* as well as *Evan*, a surname of their god, he conjectures might have been derived from that of our common mother. Strange that in *Evoë!* from whence cometh *Evan*, he did not recognise a natural cry of joy (certainly not of grief) which has no derivation whatever except from the human heart. By Adam in the garden of Eden, it might have been uttered, I am willing to admit, if you wish to be fanciful, when he awoke from his deep sleep and beheld, for the first time, his surprisingly beautiful spouse; and thereafter by the same endearing title he might have been still disposed to call her; but this, of course, would show no intimate connection betwixt him and Bacchus. In the same manner, with the editor in his opinions that Semiramis was a mere mythological emblem of Noah's dove and not the great queen of Babylon, as most persons suppose, and that the golden apples of the Hesperides, guarded by a dragon, were identical with the forbidden fruit in Eden, which, however, was not guarded by the serpent but proffered urgently to our first mother for the mere trouble of plucking, I am not yet fully persuaded to concur.

For my own part, in the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid I am pleased perhaps the best with those fables which are purely Grecian; which are not obscured by any foreign admixture or mysticism, but admit mostly of a merely physical interpretation, being the unadulterated creations of the Helenian muse. Of such [too the most classic, it seems to me, are those which narrate to us the transformations of fair, disconsolate individuals into suitable trees or vegetables. With having peopled the woods and mountains with charming rural deities the Greeks were not satisfied, but when, in his solitary rambles, some romantic one of them met with some attractive shrub or flower with whose lonely beauty he was deeply struck, to throw around it a still higher interest, he sometimes imagined for it an appropriate, pre-existent, human history. Thus, from observing the lowly laurel, green even in winter, and smiled upon by the sun, though still hiding from his beams, by some wandering poet was conceived the adventure of Daphne with Apollo; thus too from remarking the whispering of the reeds and the love of the shepherd for his pipe composed of these, by some Arcadian dreamer was brought forth the story of Syrinx and Pan; and of forlorn Echo and sad Narcissus' fate, how the tale was suggested first to some musing bard, is best narrated in the words of Keats.

“What first inspired a bard of old to sing  
Narcissus pining o'er the untainted spring?  
In some delicious ramble he had found  
A little space with boughs all woven round;  
And in the midst of all a clearer pool  
Than ere reflected in its pleasant cool  
The blue sky, here and there serenely peeping,  
Through tendril wreaths fantastically creeping.  
And on the bank a lonely flower he spied,  
A meek and forlorn flower, with naught of pride,  
Drooping its beauty o'er the watery clearness,  
To woo its own sad image into nearness:  
Deaf to light Zephyrus it would not move;  
But still would seem to droop, to pine, to love.  
So while the poet stood in this sweet spot,  
Some fainter gleamings o'er his fancy shot;  
Nor was it long ere he had told the tale  
Of young Narcissus and sad Echo's bale.”

The mythology of the Greeks however, it is well known, was not wholly of domestic growth. Of their deities some had come down to them from former nations, entire; others, though of

native production, yet received, in addition to their own, new rites and ceremonies from abroad; and not a few, with foreign gods and heroes possessed of similar attributes and functions, were wholly amalgamated. Still, this shows not surely that any one of them had floated down through corrupt tradition, merely on the memories of men, from the gates of Paradise, or from Noah's ark. Different nations putting forth spontaneously, without any preconcert on their parts, mythologies somewhat similar, seem to manifest rather that the human race in general, though modified always by outward circumstances and national peculiarities, is still moved throughout by the same natural religious promptings and yearnings. Of that divine image in which man was created and which pervaded his original constitution, from the loss in the Fall, he must ever feel, more or less, in his inmost soul, besides a sense of guilt, an incompleteness and longing after immortality. Regarding then as attempts to regain this lost image and, if possible, to solve the great problem of their humanity the different systems of mythology among the ancients, they become exceedingly interesting. Of these, of course, that of the Greeks is the most beautiful and complete. A fair and noble race brought up under the influences of the most genial clime and surrounded by the richest scenery in nature, they felt not much the weight of original sin, but full of health and cheerfulness, they were almost satisfied with their present existence. Their highest gods were deifications merely of heroes or of the powers of nature. Not like the giants of old by placing Ossa upon Pelion, to be sure, but by educating and refining their own humanities did they think to scale heaven. In this attempt, of course, they failed, but yet under the unerring hand of Providence in history they accomplished in the world an important mission. The Jews, it is true, in a supernatural manner, had been long educated and at length prepared for the glorious advent of our Saviour among themselves; but, as not for them alone, but for the Gentiles at large, was his incarnation intended, it was highly important that some of these also should be properly improved and cultivated. As such the Greeks stood forth pre-eminent. Not to themselves, moreover, were the fruits of their culture confined but into the broad bosom of the Roman Empire had been poured forth the cornucopia of their literature. Thus by their human learning were other nations of the earth greatly enriched and ennobled; and, in this manner, in no small degree, was the way prepared by the Greeks, unweittingly, to be sure, for the introduction of the Messiah's kingdom into our world; for the restoration of the divine image through the glorious coming of the Son of Man.

W. M. N.

## PUBLIC WORSHIP.

The following article is a translation of the first and second chapters of the Introduction to Prof. Ebrard's recently published "*Reformirter Kirchenbuch*." In connection with the third chapter—a translation of which may be given hereafter, it is an able argument in favor of the use of Liturgical prayers, as it obtains in the Reformed Church. The work itself exhibits the authors usual research and industry, combined with a sound discriminating judgment, and at this time of general dissent, and almost endless diversity of opinion in regard to the best mode of conducting public worship, must be regarded as a valuable contribution to the store of materials, for a thorough investigation of the general subject. In this point of view, it will be seen to be of historical as well as scientific importance.

What great evils result from the loose and informal manner, in which, in many congregations, the services of the sanctuary are conducted, is beginning to be very generally felt. With some the sermon is regarded as the only important part of public worship. The prayers are of little account, except as appropriate solemnities—the shorter, the better—to compose the mind, and prepare it for the performances of the pulpit; and at best as suitable forms of invocation for the divine blessing upon the exercises of the occasion. Farther than this, they have no special interest for them. As for the choral performances, they are estimated according to their musical merits, and have place, as agreeable interludes, for the entertainment of the hearers in which they are scarcely expected to take part.

To correct these growing evils, arising as they do from the want of a proper conception of the nature and design of worship, this collection of prayers, by Prof. Ebrard, is admirably calculated. It presents in clear light, the differences in the character and use of Liturgies as they obtain in the Christian church. In some communions, the Liturgical service is a separate and distinct part in the worship of the Sanctuary, and is regarded, perhaps, as the only essential part: In the Reformed it is intended to have its full right; but the sermon, or homiletical service, is still held to be the most important part, with which every other according to its just proportion and value, must be so connected and arranged, as to form a consistent and harmonious whole.

To a Liturgy, so constructed, expressing the pure doctrine of the Church, and intended, not as a help merely to ignorant and heartless worshippers; but to give range and expression to the loftiest aspirations of the believing soul in its approaches to the mercy seat, one would think no one would object. And yet, admitting the existence and magnitude of the evils adverted to, it may, in the pres-



ent state of feeling—I may as well say, the present state of knowledge—in the churches, be difficult to introduce any proper remedy, in many congregations. The subject has received little or no attention. The public mind to a large extent, is filled with prejudices, and would have to be disabused before any favorable impression could be made. This, however, should not prevent the attempt, and as an effort in that directions the views of Prof. Ebrard are submitted to the readers of the Review.

#### DESIGN OF THE COLLECTION.

The want of a collection of the prayers, introduced into the Reformed Church, is so generally felt, and has been expressed in such a variety of ways in the Church itself, that I may consider it superfluous to refer to it particularly, as to attempt to justify my present undertaking, on the ground of its necessity and design. The mere glance at the numerous analogous collections in the Lutheran Church, prepared in modern, and quite recent times, excites the desire that the Reformed Church should not be behind in an effort, which appears to be so entirely grounded in the character and wants of the age. On the one hand, there is certainly a general tendency in the *present scientific activity* to forsake the path of a rude empiricism, which is always content with that which is nearest at hand, as that exists for the time, and to investigate thoroughly every sphere of theoretical and practical knowledge, in its original depths and universal range; and hence the necessity with a view to the preparation of a Liturgy, that this activity in collecting and arranging materials should be directed to the whole Liturgical stock. On the other hand, this newly awakened *church life*, urges us to this, that we should turn back from the dry lifeless productions of a time, when the barren understanding held sway, and when they were introduced *per fas aut nefas*, to the living powerful prayers of a period of conscious faith, when the spirit of prayer was poured out in richer measure, and that we should no longer allow the Liturgical part of divine worship generally, in a step-motherly way, to fall in the rear of the homiletical.

This general consideration, one would think, would be itself sufficient to sustain my present undertaking, against the objection of being without purpose. It may be well however to consider the object to be accomplished a little more closely, as it is only in this way, that we can obtain the proper criteria for determining how far the present collection really answers the end for which it is intended. The end, I have in view, is a two fold one, a *practical* and a *scientific*.

To begin with the practical: Not only since my coming to Switzerland, but before and elsewhere also, I have found it necessary often to add to the church services in established use. Many of the provincial Liturgies contain only a few prayers for the current Sabbath and Week-day services, in connexion with the most necessary forms for conducting church transactions, and the want is felt that special prayers for the Feasts of the christian-church-year should also be introduced. Others, do contain prayers for the Feasts, but only one or two for each Feast; while the case calls for more. In these circumstances we have the choice, either to prepare new prayers, or to take prayers from the Liturgies of foreign Confessions, or finally, to fill up the *Agenda* of the Reformed Church, by borrowing, the one from the other. This last method is altogether easier and more natural than the second, and has many advantages over the first. Not that I would deny to the present age the qualifications for producing a Liturgy (I have myself introduced into this collection much that is new) but amid the present prevailing subjectivity, and the endless diversity of tendencies and tastes, it is certainly no easy thing to produce prayers, simple and plain enough to meet with acceptance in the whole Church, and to be regarded as common property. This is by no means an easy matter, even where the Holy Scriptures are made beforehand the standard of the contents and form of the Church prayers, and every thing is excluded that does not fully correspond with them, or that ingeniously evades what they substantially teach. Experience has taught us this. The most natural way will accordingly be, in the first place, at least to *examine* the Liturgies of sister churches of the same confession, to see whether they do not contain treasures which would relieve us of the trouble of producing them ourselves. To make such an *examination* easy is the first object of their collection.

Its practical object, however, must be considered more *generally*. It is not only that local wants require to be satisfied, or that here and there, something is wanting, in this or that particular prayer; but in the whole Reformed Church there appears to me, and to many others with me, a pressing necessity for an organic enlargement, and more complete development of divine worship. It need not be feared that I will fall in with the trite cant about the "lukewarmness and insipidity" of the Reformed worship. No one, perhaps, has set himself more in opposition to this sort of talk than myself, and for the plain reason, that what is simple is not necessarily poor. There is a majestic simplicity; the Dome of Lausanne, for instance, with its unadorn-

ed *architectural* beauty, produces a far more elevating impression, than would a Church of the same style, every column of which was hung round with flags, and figures and lamps, and every kind of splendid ornament for sensual gratification. The development and improvement of the Reformed worship which I wish to see, consists not in imitating strange and heterogeneous forms of worship, but in a regular consecutive unfolding of the elements originally and properly belonging to the Reformed Church. Thus, by way of illustration, the Reformed Church has adopted the *church-year* with its cycle of Feasts, and this too, not in just blindly holding on to an old custom, but after a severe conflict, and with the fullest conviction. And yet it is just here that its worship has remained poor inasmuch as it is limited to the Feasts, and no provision has been made for the intermediate periods from one feast to another. Now, it would certainly be an improvement if the Church year were carried forward, not as heretofore in an unbroken series of ordinary Sundays, between which the Feasts appear as isolated and unconnected points; but instead of this, were divided into Feast-periods, such as Advent, Epiphany, &c., each of which would constitute the transition from one feast to the other; and if this relation of the Church year to the annual period of term were expressed in its worship. How this can be done will appear in another place; it is sufficient here to say, that as regards this and many similar points, improvements of the Reformed worship are both possible and desirable, and most likely to be reached besides by means of a general collection of the Reformed Liturgies; in which view of course this collection may claim also a general church use.

To this now, must be added the *Theoretic* and *Scientific* signification of such a Liturgical collection. The time, when a Church will be judged solely by its dogmas, or confessional writings, and not much more by its inward life, is rapidly passing away; but where has this church life expressed itself in more significant memorials than in Liturgies? Canonically considered, the Church symbols are certainly the most authentic expressions of the Church faith; but in respect of its concrete reality, the Liturgy is equally important. The doctrines, which the real congregation acknowledges every Sunday in their prayers, are still much more expressive of its substance, than those which they have only standing upon paper. The Liturgy, accordingly, furnishes the surest standard, by which to determine which of the doctrines set forth in the confessional writings, are really of *ecclesiastical* importance, and which are only *theologically* sig-

nificant ; and surely it cannot be considered out of place, exactly at this time, when so many eyes are fixed upon Church confessions, to direct attention to the consideration of a Liturgy, as a criterion, by which the church confession should be judged and estimated according to the Church life. But as the Liturgy is the expression of ecclesiastical confessions as they appear in reality, and thus claims to be of *symbolical* importance, so is it also the index, by which the different phases of church development and declension may be known, and this is its *historical* importance. It is one thing for a church faithfully to preserve and adhere to the use of her old prayers ; another thing, owing to theological pressure, to have suffered her old prayers to fall into disuse ; though only through private self-will, without any official abrogation of an old, in the introduction of a new Liturgy ; and quite another again for a Church, formally and officially to refuse the Liturgy itself. The Reformed Church, pretty generally has kept to the first too positions.

In all these respects, is a complete collection of the *Agenda* of the Reformed Church of indispensable necessity ; and inasmuch as I was drawn to this work by inclination and desire, as well as by many outward inducements, and was also placed in such circumstances as greatly facilitated a collection of Reformed Church books. I did not hesitate in God's name to address myself to the work, and must say that it has afforded me, not only the purest satisfaction, but also true edification. May it be a blessing to many whole congregations, as well as individuals.

I have yet a word to say respecting this collection, so far as it is intended for the *scientific use of individuals, and at the same time for the church use of Congregations*. Two ways were before me. One was to print the whole of the church prayers, I had registered, together with all the variations occurring in the several editions of one and the same Liturgy, word for word, with diplomatic faithfulness. In that case, the Collection would fully meet the scientific end intended, but not the practical. Another would first have to come, and make use of the material thus collected for the draft of a particular and scientific liturgy. But could I expect (merely to mention such an external consideration) that in such a one sided procedure, I would find persons to take it off my hands ? How many are there who have any interest in the preparation of new Liturgies ? How many, who are so engrossed with scientific Liturgical studies, that they would provide themselves with such a collection solely for this purpose ? And what, with all my diplomatic faithfulness and acute verbal accuracy, would be gained by documents, which so far as they



generally are originally German, are nevertheless of modern date, and by no means peculiarly distinguished by any interesting orthographic or stylistic properties, which could not quite as well be studied in a thousand other books of the same period? A few slight alterations will often render an old prayer serviceable for our times, and this practical advantage I would have to forego for the sake of some unimportant archaism! This course, I was altogether unwilling to take. The other way was, with all becoming respect for and use of the old prayers, to prepare an entirely new Liturgy. In this way, the practical want would perhaps be provided for—perhaps! for it would depend upon this, whether I would succeed in making it acceptable to all, or even a part; and then, in either case, it would be assuming a great responsibility, and would expose me to the danger of hearing it said: “If he had only left the old prayers unaltered, they would have been far better than those he has given us.” But then the work also would have ceased to be a *Collection*, and its scientific design would have been wholly frustrated. To this course, I had no inclination.

I therefore sought a middle course, and was not long in finding it. A *collection of existing prayers* was the work I had undertaken to perform; but I would so collect, and arrange what I did collect, that it could at once be brought into practical use. It may be objected, that this is not possible, or at most only possible, in case all that is old may be taken as at once fit for use. My collection itself however will prove, I trust, that this objection does not hold against it, and that a union of both these objects was not only possible, but practicable also without much difficulty.

As regards the text—I have made alterations, wherein they appeared necessary, to avoid offence by archaisms whether of form or sense. In such cases, *I have placed the old reading* along side in annotations, so that it might also be made use of for scientific purposes, whilst the text could be made to serve the practical end. I have permitted myself in no case to change the spirit of the prayer, or to alter its style, inasmuch as I did not consider this to be necessary for practical purposes. Why should not a church express its praise to God in various words and ways? Why should not all the different tones which have been heard from age to age in her worship, be heard in it again? That which was unclassical, and bad in its own day, I have rejected: of this however I found but little.

The prayers I have given, are of different kinds. Some are more dogmatical; others are more full of feeling; others soar

on high in the sphere of hymnological poetry; some are earnest and grave; others childlike, bordering here and there even on the playful. I have, as a glance at my work will show, only excluded that which seemed to pass the bounds of truth, propriety, and good taste. In other respects each prayer retains its peculiar character. So the collection presents itself to view. Very many of the prayers are marked by no striking peculiarity. They constitute an order that I would like to call the *classical*. They remain new for all ages. To these, in preference to all others, belong the prayers of the French and Basle Liturgies. The Holland and Lower Rhine and Palatine Liturgies are somewhat more in the dogmatizing style. The Neufchatel prayers are marked by an animated and animating psalmodic strain. Those of St. Gall, by a childlike simplicity, and inward depth of feeling, to preserve which I felt my duty, and therefore omitted many alterations which others, perhaps, might think desirable.

#### GENERAL CHARACTER OF THE WORSHIP IN THE THREE PRINCIPAL DIVISIONS OF THE REFORMED CHURCH.

The whole of the Church, which by the adoption of the Form of Concord, was shut out from the Lutheran, and which has been known since, in a narrow sense, as the "REFORMED CHURCH" is made up of several groups of provincial churches, which though they may fully agree in doctrine, in opposition to both the Papist and Lutheran theories of the Lord's supper, are nevertheless divided into several Classes, in respect of their origin, the manner of their reformation, their church order and worship as well as their constitution. This is evident from the *passive* commencement of the Reformed Church. She had no desire, from the first, to be the Reformed Church, *par excellence*; or to be *another*, along side of the Lutheran; she wished rather, with the Lutheran, to be the Reformed, that is, the reconstructed Church. Those States of the Empire for instance, which were excluded as "Reformed" by the Form of Concord, desired throughout to be reckoned with those, which are bound to the Augsburg Confession; and maintained with effect, both at the Conference of the princes at Nuremberg, in 1561, and at the Imperial Diet at Augsburg, in 1564, that the Augsburg Confession only excluded the Zuinglian (officially given up by the Zurichers themselves after the Cons. Tigur.) and not the Melancthonian Calvinistic doctrine. They had the more right to do so, inasmuch as the Strassburgers and Upper Rhinelanders,

after the adoption of the very equivocal Wittenberg Concord, had been acknowledged by Luther himself, as still belonging to the family of the Augsburg Confession. Those States of the empire also, which, through the management of the Flaccian party, were cut off from the communion of the Augsburg Confession, never would have given occasion of themselves for such a separation. They were compelled in a *passive* way, to form themselves, in connexion with the existing evangelical churches without the empire, into a *particular* church, in contradistinction to the Lutheran. Not that a unity or union with them, was then for the first time attempted or brought about. They already maintained in their relation to the foreign German churches, that general unity, and consciousness of fraternal feeling, which they would gladly have maintained with the Lutheran, but could not. A unity of worship and discipline was in fact never attempted; each particular church was left to its own peculiar development in secondary matters, without limitation; the only thing regarded as important was unity in essentials, in doctrine and fellowship and love.

In this way, it may be accounted for, that in the so-called "Reformed Church," there exists a certain diversity of orders of worship. *Three classes* of provincial churches are clearly to be distinguished: the *Zuinglian*, the *Calvinistic*, and the *Melanchthonian*, or German Reformed.

The Reformation in Zurich, and the eastern Cantons in Switzerland, originated from a stock entirely different from that of Germany. It is true that the activity of Zuingli, at first, extended far into South Germany, but his influence there was entirely destroyed by the syngrammatical controversy, and from 1524 onward, the Zuinglian Church of German Switzerland stood as an isolated member, by the side of the Church of the empire, viz: the Church of the Augsburg Confession, and the accession to the Wittenberg Concord only produced momentary interruptions of this isolation.

The Burgundian branch of the Reformation of Switzerland, and the still more remote Romaic, Wallonic and lastly the Netherland branches, proceeded from *Calvin*, a theologian, who, although in the commencement of his career, 1536-'39, he co-operated with Farel, who sympathized with Zuingli, nevertheless occupied a wholly different stand point, and was indeed averse to Zuinglianism. In 1539-'41, as a member of the Church of the Augsburg Confession, he was particularly active in the religious conferences at Worms and Ratisbon. He was also connected with Melancthon, by ties of the strictest friendship.

Returning to Geneva, he proceeded with the Reformation 1541-'44, in a thoroughly independent way, in almost incessant conflict with the Zuinglian church of Berne, in doctrine considered a "Lutheran," endeavoring to subvert the Zuinglian theory of the Lord's supper and succeeding too in accomplishing it by the gentleness and candor of spirit which he maintained.

In Germany the States, which from 1577 onward, belonged to the Reformed Church, were neither under Zuingli's, nor Calvin's, but much more particularly under Melancthon's influence; and so far as the Palatinate, the very heart of the Ger. Ref. Church was concerned, Calvin had there only an indirect influence, obtained partly by having been brought into more or less friendly relations with her eminent theologians during his residence in Germany, in 1539-'41, and partly by the acquaintance he made with German divines travelling in Switzerland.

Let us see now what form of Worship obtained in these three principal divisions of the Reformed Church; for as regards worship we may leave out of sight altogether the English Episcopal Church, while the Scotch, and the Hungarian also, as it appears, belong to the Calvinistic group.

ZUINGLI strange as it may seem, in the changes in worship which he made, was influenced by a conservative principle. The formulary for the Lord's supper, which he introduced in the place of the mass, is nothing more than an expurgated revision of the Gregorian Mass-canon itself, and is favorably distinguished from other formularies of the Reformed Church, by the brevity and simplicity of its prayers, the richness of its composition, and the retention of responses, &c. So also the formulary for baptism, although simpler, is constructed after the old form, and even retains the use of the baptismal robe. Kneeling in prayer is also retained, and was only dispensed with at a later period. The homiletical service is particularly simple, quite as much so, as in the Roman Church, where the sermon stands by itself. The sermon is introduced by a prayer, and is followed by a general confession, and concluding prayer. Singing by the Congregation was not abolished, for the good reason that it was never practised. It was only Church singing that was done away. In Basle, and Shaffhausen—in Basle as, early as 1526—singing was introduced as an entirely new element, and if in Zurich it was introduced only towards the close of the Century, it is to be accounted for by the pertinacity with which, after Zuingli's death, all his regulations were maintained. The putting away of pictures, which was done because they were regarded as idols, and not as works of art, is the only thing in which Zuingli did not proceed conservatively. That, in all



other matters—in retaining the baptismal font, and crosses over graves, private baptism, the form of “*Vater unser*” and especially the Church constitution, as it regards the distinction between Deacons, Ministers and Deans, and the Collegiate foundations—he proceeded more conservatively than Calvin, or rather Farel, I have elsewhere shewn.

The Zuinglian form of worship, as in the lapse of time, it has developed and established itself, and where it exists pure and unmixed, is the following: The service is introduced with an invocation, and the announcement of the hymn. The singing is followed by a Liturgical prayer; then the text and sermon; then the Confession of sin, with a prayer for pardon; after this the concluding prayer and hymn; lastly the announcement of the betrothed and deceased, an exhortation to mutual intercessory prayer and the benediction. If baptism is to be performed, it takes place between the sermon and the last prayer. The Lord’s prayer is recited twice, and in case of a baptism three times. On Festivals the Communion is administered immediately after the concluding prayer.

The *worship* of the CALVINISTIC CHURCH is of an entirely different and more consequential character. It may be said that Zuingli, in order to the introduction of any thing new, abolished too little. He held on too firmly to existing forms, and in confining the Lord’s supper to the principal feasts, he left nothing for the ordinary Sundays, but the sermon. Calvin, on the other hand, made free room for the introduction of new forms; and for this was indebted to Farel. He had made root and branch work with everything before Calvin came to Geneva, and left nothing but the naked and bald sermon. Here was a free field for Calvin’s practical activity. He introduced none of the old forms, Roman, or Lutheran. On the contrary, he produced forms that were entirely new, fresh from the fountain, the central point of evangelical faith. He constructed a Liturgy, and introduced the singing of hymns, some the composition of the refugee Marot, and some his own. The preaching of the gospel, the exposition of the text constituted the central point. All that precedes conducts to it, and is the transition from profane life to the evangelical announcement; all that follows is the transition again from the proclamation of grace to the life which is to be sanctified. When the congregation is assembled, it is met by the *law*, in the reading of the ten commandments, *not* by the Minister, but very properly by a Clerk. The Minister then ascends the pulpit, and in prayer with the congregation, offers the *confession of sin*, of open guilt—a part that certainly

has its proper place here, and not after the sermon, inasmuch as the first thing we should realize, upon entering the temple of God, is the need of divine grace. Singing by the congregation then succeeds. A *prayer for divine illumination* conducts to the *text* and *sermon*. With it, is connected a prayer for the divine blessing, in the advancement of the kingdom of God in the hearts of individuals, and the world at large, and a *hymn* and the benediction close the service. The congregation enters with a *sense of the need* of the forgiveness of sins, and having received the *consolations of divine grace*, is dismissed and accompanied by the *Benediction* to their homes. Baptism is here appended to the sermon; and the Lord's supper, which according to Calvin's order should be administered every Sunday—follows the benediction. The formulary for the Lord's supper is, at the same time, exceedingly simple, and in liturgical beauty is far behind the Zuinglian. It is besides too doctrinal; whilst the other confining itself chiefly to scriptural phrases, avoids every thing like doctrinal exposition.

THE GERMAN REFORMED CHURCH, in the end, after she saw herself shut out from the Lutheran, in part, unintentionally, and in part with design, imitated the Calvinistic worship. Still there arose, in various ways in her worship, a peculiar element, (it appeared originally also, in the Zuinglian Agenda) the *separation of the liturgical part of the service from the homiletical*. In the churches of the Lower Rhine, for instance, the service began formerly with a morning hymn, then followed a long, purely liturgical prayer, for the States, the Church, &c.; a prayer which had no reference to the sermon that was to follow, but had its significancy wholly independent of it, as an intercessory prayer. Then came the hymn before sermon, the text and sermon followed simply with the Lord's prayer; the benediction closing the whole service.

The question now arises: should not the worship of the Reformed Church be so constructed as to embrace the advantages of each of these three forms? The Calvinistic ground principles must continue to be the foundation. The superior advantages which the Zuinglian Liturgy has in particular parts must be combined, so that the too-highly-wrought doctrinal coloring in some places of the Calvinistic Liturgy may be softened down. Lastly, the German Reformed separation of the liturgical from the homiletical must also have its right, so far, that the prayers before and after sermon, should not succeed it immediately, but be separated from it by the singing of the congregation, so that both the liturgical parts of the service, to be more independent,

should take the homiletical part between them. This would be an organic development and improvement of the Reformed worship. To make this more fully appear however, we must enquire more particularly concerning the principles of Evangelical worship, in general.

Baltimore, Md.

B. C. W.

---

#### BROWNSON'S REVIEW AGAIN.

The last number of *Brownson's Quarterly Review* contains an article of some length, in the way of reply to our January paper on its championship of Romanism. We have no reason to complain of the tone and spirit with which it is written. It gives us full credit for sincerity and honesty of purpose, and takes pains to treat us with manly consideration and respect. It shows itself duly sensible also of the merits of our argument for Protestantism; as far as this could be considered at all possible for a standpoint so thoroughly Roman, as we have already found that to be which is occupied by the respondent. As a whole, of course, our reasoning is set down as fallacious and false; and an effort is made to burden it with consequences which are fatal to the whole idea of Christianity; but care is taken, at the same time, not to charge these consequences upon us directly as part and parcel of our own faith. We are supposed to be entangled in them unconsciously and by implication, rather than with clear logical insight. This is all polemically right and fair. The true consequences of a system have legitimate force against it, whether its advocates have ability to perceive them or not; and it is always proper to drag them into view for this purpose, so far as a superior logic may render it possible. We object not to the severity of some of Dr. Brownson's representations, in this view. If the results he tries to fasten upon us were indeed necessarily involved in our arguments it would deserve much of the censure it is made to receive at his hands. We should ourselves join him heartily in its condemnation. We own no such results as our own. If they belong to our system, they have no place at least in our mind or heart. It is our logic which must be taken to be at fault in this case, and not what we cherish and value as our faith. We are not yet brought, however, to acknowledge any such dualism here between these two orders of thought. Not only do we repudiate the irreligious consequences in ques-

tion, as no part of our faith; we do not allow them either to be fairly deducible from our philosophy or theology. On the other hand, the positions taken by Mr. Brownson, at certain points, seem to us clearly to confirm what we have already urged in the way of objection against the Roman system. It is not necessary to say that he shows himself at once acute and profound, and that the weapons of his warfare are handled with dexterity and power. The argument belongs to a field, where few are so much at home, and has to do with topics which few are so well fitted to manage with effect. But with all this, his dialectics, on the great subject here at stake, are by no means equal to the task he has undertaken, in pretending to vindicate Romanism at the bar of reason. To our mind at least, the plea remains as before defective and unsatisfactory.

The grand aim of Mr. Brownson, in this article, is to run us into *pantheism*; such a view of the universe as confounds it with the idea of God, and so resolves itself at last into pure autotheism or nihilism; "to which" he says, "we have shown over and over again, all Protestantism, whatever its form, has an invincible tendency." To this end flows, he tells us, the view we take of the relation between subject and object in the constitution of the world, as well as what we say of the relation of the general to the particular. To affirm that the object without subject is unreal, or a pure abstraction, amounts with him to an affirmation that all reality is subjective, in the sense of Fichte, and that the objective as such has no existence whatever. This, we are told, is to make God himself dependent on the thinking and willing of men. He is reduced at best to the character of infinite void, mere abstract possibility, seeking to become *plenum*, full, or real in the life of the world. But such abstract possibility is a nullity, can do nothing, bring nothing to pass; "then there is no world, and if there is no world, and God is a nullity, nothing is or exists," and so we are landed in pure nullism, or nihilism, as just now said. To the like result is carried out by the Critic our view of the relation between the natural and the supernatural. To affirm an organic or inwardly living correspondence between these different spheres of existence, is to confound and overthrow, he thinks, the distinction by which they stand apart. God must be out of the world, and beyond it altogether, in order to be truly self-existent and independent. So in the sphere of nature; and so also in the sphere of mind or will. The Critic will hear accordingly of no *autonomy* in this latter world. "Nothing can be worse than this," he tells us, "for it supposes the law is created, and in part at least by



man himself." To make man active at all in the constitution of the law, is taken to be tantamount to a claim of self-creation in his favor; which must be regarded of course as a full lapse again into the vortex of pantheism or nullism as before. Our view of the relation between faith and divine truth, is made to plunge headlong over the same awful precipice. To require a real inward union of the two, in such sense that the first shall appear the very form under which the second has its subsistence for men, is to reduce this last to the character of a simple abstract possibility. "It is the object that gives the form or species," the Critic tells us, "and to contend that it is the subject, is simply making man, if creation is supposed, the creator, and God the creature,—that is, man makes God, and not God man!" Such a theory leaves no room, of course, for the idea of revelation, in any true and proper sense. And so, finally, our Christology, the view we take of Christ's person and the mystery of the incarnation, is charged with the same general fault, as tending to break down the distinction that should of right hold perpetually between the order of nature and the order of grace. Christ, we are told, is the author of the new creation, but no part of it in his own person; just as he is the old creation, only *mediante actu creativo*, by the act of creating it, and in no more intimate way. To make him the real fountain of Christianity itself, is gravely represented as a full identification of his life with that of his people, and runs, we are told, into palpable pantheism.

Mr. Brownson, as we have before said, does not mean to lay all this to our charge, as something contemplated and proposed on our part with heresy prepense. He means only, that our premises lead necessarily to such end. We think it well, however, to put in here a formal disavowal of the pantheistic conceptions, one and all, which are supposed thus to lurk in our system. The idea "that God is real being only in that he is creator, and actually creates *ad extra*," is none of ours. We have not the slightest sympathy with the theory of Spinoza. We believe the world to be God's free act, and as such in no sense necessary to the fulness of his own being. We have never dreamed of any such autonomy on the side of the created will, as might make it the source or reason of the law. This we hold to be of absolute and universal necessity, though ten thousand worlds should conspire to set its power aside. We recognize fully the distinction between the natural and the supernatural, and the necessity of revelation for the purposes of religion. Faith never makes the truth it is brought to embrace; it simply makes it to be truly present, and so authenticates its existence,

for the sphere of created intelligence into which it is thus actually introduced. We carefully distinguish Christ from his Church, while yet we hold them to be in a deep sense one, even as the head and members are indissolubly joined together in the living constitution of one and the same body. Most certainly, "we are not made one with him in the sense of identity with him, nor are we *deified*." The position of Christ, as we have taken occasion often to say, is absolute and central; while that of his people is relative only and peripheral. He is the *only* begotten Son of God; we are sons only through him, by adoption and living insertion into his life, the process of what the Scriptures call eating his flesh and drinking his blood, as the true condition of all righteousness and immortality.

But now, as we take it, the truth, in opposition to these several pantheistic consequences charged upon us by Mr. Brownson, does not stand on the other side in their simple negation and contradiction. There is another class of conceptions in this form, and which the common understanding is always prone to lay hold of as the necessary and only alternative in the case, that go just as directly and surely in the end to exclude God from the world, and to unsettle all the foundations of religion. These are comprehended collectively in the idea of *dualism*, or abstract deism, which may be taken as the immediate reverse of what is properly pantheism in the bad and false sense. It may be said that dualism involves a great truth, the actual distinction of God and the world; and this we are freely willing to admit; but it is just as certain, on the other side, and just as necessary too to be affirmed always, that pantheism also involves a great truth; such a truth indeed as may be said to meet us on almost every page of the Bible, as well as from the inmost and profoundest depths of our own religious nature. That is a poor and cheap orthodoxy, in any case, which stands barely in the rejection of error in some one direction, while it makes no account of the danger, always at hand, of falling under the power of its natural counterpart in a direction just the opposite. We are bound to do justice, in the case before us, to the truth which underlies pantheism, as well as to that which underlies dualism; and we are not more bound to fear and avoid heresy in the first shape, than we are bound to avoid and fear it also in the second shape. It has been our wish at least, and our honest endeavor, to keep clear of both extremes, as well as to acknowledge and honor the great truths out of which both grow. Mr. Brownson, we are sorry to say, in common with a large amount of what we conceive to be bad Protestantism, (the almost universal thinking,

we might say perhaps, of New England,) turns the two phases of thought into the form of a simple syllogistic dilemma, where one horn is the only resting place from the other, and avoids and rejects thus the pantheistic extreme only in such a way as to lay himself open, in our estimation, to the charge of dualism. We distinguish of course, as he also has done in our case, between his theory and himself, and speak of what the first is by necessary consequence, as it strikes our own mind, rather than by open and direct avowal; although at some points, the general consequence itself might seem to be not indistinctly allowed, in the particular propositions by which we find it indirectly affirmed. The facility with which he throws us continually into the wrong, serves only to illustrate, as we take it, the fault and wrong of his own position. It shows this to be itself a dialectical extreme, whose very character it is always to condemn in a wholesale way, as its own opposite, all that is different from itself, or that carries towards it in any way the aspect of negation. No such extreme can ever live by simply killing its opposite; but only by coming to a true inward reconciliation with it in the power of a higher idea, whose province it is, in such case, not to destroy absolutely on either side, but rather as regards both to complete and fulfill.

Abstract deism, as distinguished from the true *theism* of Christianity, it is hardly necessary to say, is not in and of itself an exclusion absolutely of God from the world. It prides itself rather in being an acknowledgment of God, under the character of the great first cause and end of all things. In this view, however, he is taken to be always out of the world, beyond it, over and above it, and in no sense truly immanent in its constitution and life. His relation to the world is that of a mechanician to a machine. It is the product of his mind and hand; it works according to his will; it goes forward under the superintendence of his eye; while he remains himself, whether near at hand or afar off, wholly on the outside of it, abstract and independent altogether as another order of being. Such dualism may refuse the idea of revelation entirely; but it can with equal ease also allow it, after its own fashion. In the first case, it is mere naturalism or rationalism, in the most direct form; teaching that man has no need to go beyond the world as it now stands, for the solution of the problem involved in his existence; and that he must be necessarily inaccessible indeed to the literally supernatural, for the reason simply that it *transcends* his own nature, and so cannot enter it in the way of real knowledge, or appropriation. In the second case, we have abstract

supranaturalism; which owns and seeks the supernatural, in the Bible or in the Church, as the necessary and at the same time possible complement of the natural, but will not allow still the chasm to be in any way filled that sunders the one from the other. The relation remains at last, what it was at first, extrinsic and mutually exclusive; while all conjunction in the case is found to be mechanical only, and thus more or less magical and unfree. A general convenient illustration of both these errors, is furnished by the question concerning inspiration. Rationalism reduces it at once to a nullity, by resolving all into the natural activity of the human mind. Abstract supranaturalism asserts on the contrary a higher activity, the moving power of the Holy Ghost; but in doing so, at the same time, sets the Divine wholly on the outside of the human; in consequence of which, this last sinks into the character of a mere passive organ or instrument, in the service of the first. The error in this form is of course more respectable than the error in the other form; but in both cases the proper truth of the doctrine is missed, and its rightful authority more or less overthrown. Inspiration transcends nature; but it is on the other hand a real entrance of the supernatural into this lower sphere. The Bible in this respect is just as thoroughly human, as it is found to be also heavenly and divine. The evidence of this meets us from every page and line. Not merely are the words human words; but the thoughts also are human thoughts, as intimately joined with these words as thoughts are in any other case with their own language, which we know to be the very intimacy itself of soul and body. No two of the sacred writers think alike or speak alike. On the contrary the individual nature of every one of them is exalted, and so made to be more specifically peculiar and characteristic, through his gift of inspiration, than it would be if presented to us under any other circumstances. *How* all this is accomplished, is not here the question. We have to do only with the fact. This includes two sides; one natural and the other supernatural; which however do not stand each on the outside of the other, in such a way that the action of one becomes all and the action of the other nothing; but are so brought together as to be both truly and really concerned, as joint factors, in the result which is brought to pass. Holy men of old *spake*, as they were *moved* by the Holy Ghost. The speech is *human* speech, in all respects, under Divine motion. Any theory of inspiration which leaves this out of view, or which implies the contrary in any way, is of course radically defective and false.



And so, we say, in the relation which God sustains to the world generally, as its Creator and Preserver, we are required to see neither pantheism nor dualism; neither a necessary self-explication simply of his own being, on the one hand, nor yet such an outwardness and disjunction, on the other hand, as implies in fact two different worlds, two separate and independent spheres of being. Even Nature itself has a constitution and life of its own; it is no mere apparition or shadow; its powers are real powers; its laws are true laws; it is not in this respect a mere system of *occasionalism*, the inefficient show only of what is taking place, while all in truth proceeds by immediate act of God. And still under this form, it can never, for one moment, or at a single point, be sundered from God; it subsists in *Him* continually, as the very ground of its whole constitution; its powers and laws are of no force, save as they flow forth unceasingly from the activity of his will. This activity is just as full, as omnipotent, as universally present, in the preservation of the world from hour to hour, as it was in its original creation. Not a sparrow falls without his hand. In Him, really and truly, we live, and move, and have our being. Of him, through him, and to him, (*ἐξ αὐτοῦ, καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰς αὐτόν τὰ πάντα*, Rom. xi. 36,) from him as their beginning, in and by him as their constant cause and medium, and to him again as their absolute and universal end, are all things. *Such* pantheism the Bible teaches, and we are bound to admit. It is the very character of a true childlike religious faith itself, thus to *see* God in the stars, to *hear* him in the winds, to *mark* his stately goings in all the processes of nature. And so when we rise from the world of mere Nature up to the world of Mind, as this meets us in the constitution of man, it is still always the same mystery we are called to admire and adore. God is different from the thinking, and willing, and working of men; and yet all thought and will are conditioned and made possible, only through the universe of life which has its seat in himself. He is the foundation of the moral world. It holds throughout in the presence of his intelligence and the activity of his will. Truth and freedom exist from him, and by him, as their necessary ground. The law which upholds all ethical relations, and by which the organical structure of society subsists, is the utterance continually of his very life. History, unfolding from age to age the progress of humanity, is not something separate from God; full as little certainly, to say the least, as any such thought may be tolerated of the course of dumb blind nature. It moves throughout, though in a free way, in obedience to an all comprehending law or plan,

as truly as this may be said of the planets; and this law resolves itself finally into the intelligence and will of Him, who is at once the beginning, the middle, and the end of all things. The intelligence and will of God are immanent in the process itself; so that it may be said truly to be a revelation of what he is in the world; just as we may say the same thing of the natural heavens, which *declare* his glory and *show forth* his presence in the most direct and real way. This is not Buddhism. History is not necessary to complete God himself; as nature is not necessary either for any such end. It is no process of self-evolution, by which he is to be regarded as coming to be actually what he is otherwise only potentially, the transition of the logical Nothing into the logical Something; God as pure being into God as the living universe. History is not an emanation of the Divine life, in any such sense as to be the necessary form of this life itself. God is complete without it, and lives with absolute fulness beyond it in the way of personal self-consciousness and freedom. He is the free cause even of his own being; and how much more then of all his works. But still in such free view, we have a right to speak of history as the actual presence notwithstanding of his life, as the very form in which he reveals himself so as to show forth in an actual way the sense of what this life contains. By being free, it does not cease still to be God's act, and in this view a process of real self-explication, by which he comes forth from the depths of eternity into the syllabled speech of time, and so makes himself known for the adoration of angels and men. We see no pantheism in this; but only the pure living theism of the Bible, in opposition to the dead mechanical abstractions of that dualistic deism, which converts the world into a grand watch, and sees in the Maker of it the clever artist only who has contrived and set in motion its wheels and springs.

"Following modern philosophy," Mr. Brownson says, "which teaches that God is real only in that he is creator, the Reviewer can assert that God lives, is living God, only by asserting that he lives in the life of the world, that is, as he explains it, 'in the thinking and willing of single minds.' His system seems to us to be based on the supposition, that God comes to reality only in the life of the universe, and that the universe, whether natural or supernatural, is simply the evolution or development, that is, realization, of the abstract potentialities or possibilities of the Divine nature. —Hence the significance and sacredness of history. It is God's realization of his own potentiality, in space and time, or his *coming* to reality."—P. 208. This, it

will be seen, is a wholly false view of what we have wished to say. It makes no distinction between a necessary emanation and a free act, and reduces to the conception of a physical process what we hold always to be the work of intelligence and will in their highest form. Even the necessity by which God himself exists, what is sometimes called his *aseity*, we hold to be a free necessity, and not a blind fate excluding thought and will; for this would shut us up to the everlasting impersonal *substance* of Spinoza. The being of God is his own eternal act, resting in nothing and conditioned by nothing beyond the free activity from which it springs. All his works of course are no less free. But for this very reason, on the other hand, they have no subsistence save by the immanent force of his all-producing will at every point. The world has its end no less than its beginning, its *terminus ad quem* full as much as its *terminus a quo*, in God only. It is not in this respect like a plan which an artist projects, and then carries into execution. Plan and execution fall here completely together. To suppose an outward reason or aim of any sort, in the Divine Mind, is in truth to subject his action to a foreign force, and so to overthrow the absolute aseity of his nature. The universe must be taken, from first to last; as wholly and only from himself. The law itself in this view is his work. True, it is eternal, and has its seat in the very nature of God; but it has its seat there, not out of any necessity by which his will may be supposed to be ruled from behind itself, but by the infinite activity of this will itself.

It may now appear in what sense, and in what sense only, we have ever dreamed of allowing man a will or voice in the constitution of the law by which he is required to be governed. "To assert man's authority, or right to be governed only by his own will," according to Mr. Brownson, "is to deny that he is under law, or bound at all to seek God as the Sovereign Good. Does the Reviewer maintain that we are not morally bound to seek God as our ultimate end? Does he deny all morality, and assert that man is free to live as he lists?" Nothing of this sort, we reply; nothing of this sort whatever. All we mean to say is, that mind is not matter; that morality is not nature; that the law of freedom, to be different from the law of blind necessity, must come to its actualization in the world, not in the way of merely outward force under any view, but through the self-moving spontaneity of its own subjects, the thinking and willing of the created minds in which it works and reigns. The planets obey a law which they have no power to accept or not accept; it is in them, but not from them or of them in any way;

and for this very reason their action is blind and unfree. So throughout *Nature*, as such. Its very character is to be without autonomy in its own order of existence. The Moral, on the contrary, as distinguished from the Natural, is self-conscious, self-active, in a certain sense we may say even self-productive, and in such form truly free. It is not made, except as it at the same time makes itself. It is not moved, save as it originates its own motion. It stands, like all created existence, in the power of law; but the law here is not from abroad simply, as in the case of mere nature, not objective and outward only, but inward also and subjective; it is brought to pass, comes to its actualization in the world, only in the form of being apprehended and willed by its subjects. On the outside of such self-conscious life it can have no being in the world whatever. Turn it in any way into mere blind force, simple outward compulsion, and all proper morality is at an end. The necessary medium of its revelation, the very element in which it exists and makes itself felt, is the self-moving activity of the life it is formed to bind; which at the same time has full power to be untrue to itself by refusing the authority of its proper law, and which can be rightly bound by this in the end only as it receives the law freely into its own constitution, and so enacts it into force for its own use. Mind thus, by its very constitution, is required to be autonomic, self-legislative, a true fountain and source of law for itself; while the law notwithstanding has its ultimate ground only in God, and can be of no force whatever as the product merely of any lower intelligence. Objective and subjective here must fall absolutely together. The will without the law is false; denies its own proper nature; falls over to the sphere of bondage and sin. But the law, on the other hand, without the will, has no power either to accomplish its proper work. Only as the law, previously necessary by Divine constitution, is *willed*, freely embraced, affirmed and constituted, by the created intelligence it is ordained to rule, so as to be at the same time the product of this, its own act virtually and deed, can there be any true escape from the idea of slavery, any true entrance into the sphere of freedom, any morality or religion in the full and right sense of these terms. It is this union of law and will, necessity and liberty, not outwardly but inwardly, which brings the life of man emphatically to its proper form. This is what we mean by the autonomy of the human subject, the right of man to be governed by his own will and not simply by a heteronomic force acting upon him from beyond his will, the voice that belongs to him properly in the constitution of the law which he is called to obey.



Our objection to the Roman doctrine, as we understand it to be exhibited by Mr. Brownson, is that the law objectively taken is so far sundered from the activity of the obeying subject, as to be in fact set over against this in the character of another nature altogether, and under a wholly outward form. Objective and subjective are made to fall apart dualistically into two distinct worlds. We do not wish to confound them, to mix them together, or to make one absorb and destroy the other; we recognize their difference; but still we object just as strenuously also to this abstract separation. Allow that we may not be able to show in what way precisely the two interests of authority and freedom flow together, this is no reason still why we should give up the claims of either in favor of the other. We may not subordinate authority to the independence of man, so as to make him his own lord and master, with liberty to follow simply his private pleasure; but just as little have we any right to affirm such separate mastery in favor of the law, to the exclusion of man's mind and voice. Authority on the outside of the will, in no union with it, standing over against it simply as a foreign force, though it should be the authority of God himself, can bring with it no strength, no freedom, no life. The case demands an inward mediation; such an entrance of the law into the sphere of the subject's own life, that it shall seem to be part of his very nature, and to grow forth spontaneously from the activity of his will. It is the "law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus," the law as the power of self-moving spirit in the soul itself, that makes it free from the law of sin and death. This implies oneness of nature between the power that binds, and the activity which allows itself thus to be bound; and it is only on the ground of such correspondence that the relation requiring them to be so joined can be said to hold from the beginning.

Mr. Brownson charges us with great confusion, as well as fundamental error, for making object and subject dependent on each other in the realization of truth, and for resolving the first separately taken into the general, as distinguished from the particular; which is he tells us, to make the object the product of the subject, and in the end to overthrow the existence of particular concrete objects altogether. We still say however, that there can be no truth or law in the world of mind under a purely objective form; for the reason that intelligence and will are needed to make room for any such existence, and to bring it actually to pass. Truth exists, *as truth*, only by being known. Blot out all knowledge, all consciousness, all thought, and you blot out all truth at the same time. Intelligence is the light in which it reveals its presence, the very form in which it becomes

real. Will it be said, that is to make God himself dependent on the thinking and willing of men, and so to resolve his being into mere void, or abstract possibility, seeking to become *plenum*, full and real in the life of the world? We reply, by no means. God is at once Object and Subject, in the most universal sense. His existence is the absolute union of both. As object merely, without self-knowledge and self-activity he would not be the God of the Bible, but the very abstraction of Buddhism itself, the infinite Nothing from which it is pretended here so anxiously to fly on the other side. To conceive of God as necessarily existent under a purely objective form, without regard to his own intelligence and will; as though these had to do with the first in a secondary way only, finding the object at hand previously for their use; is a thought in its own nature fatal to all sound theology, full as much as the imagination which allows him no independent personality whatever. Dualism in this shape, is only pantheism back upon us again with a new face. The necessity by which God exists, as we have before said, is a free necessity; it has ground, not from beyond his own will, but in the activity of his will itself. He is eternally self-produced. His being is not merely an object, but an *act*, his own act, going forth always from an exercise of thought and will. In this consists his Personality; which at the same time is *absolute*; carries in itself no reference to any object or thing beyond itself, but affirms itself with illimitable self-sufficiency from within as the Infinite I AM, which is at the same time and must be the everlasting ground of all life and being besides. And so then in the constitution of the universe under God, object and subject can never fall absolutely asunder, but are required to go always together as joint factors in the determination of all proper *reality*, in the world. Nature itself exists only for mind; and in this view, moreover, the proper truth and sense of it are found not at all in the single particular things belonging to it as these may be perceived by the senses merely, but in the ideas rather they reveal and represent, which come from beyond, which are always general or universal in their nature, and which can have no being or presence in the world whatever, save under the form of thought and by the activity of self-apprehending and self-moving intelligence. Truth thus, in the moral world under God, considered as objective merely is always something general. So is law. In such form exclusively, however, they can have no force in the concrete constitution of man's life. For this purpose, they must become subjective, or in other words enter into the sphere of particular thought and will. This is not to

subordinate them in any sense to the power of such thought and will ; as though truth and law might be considered the product simply of men themselves. Men make neither truth nor law. These have an absolute necessity beyond their will, and underlie the very order out of which their whole existence springs. But still truth and law actualize themselves in the world, become concrete and thus real for men, only as they are incorporated with their life, and pass over in this way from a purely objective character to a character which is at the same time subjective and individual.

In this realization of reason and law, however, their character as general is not lost. It is not every man's thinking and willing privately taken that can thus make room for them in the world ; but only such private thinking and willing as are comprehended in the life of the world as a whole. In this way mind collectively taken is more always than mere single thought and will ; not simply as it is the aggregate of individual opinions numerically joined together, but as it brings us nearer also to what may be considered the proper wholeness of truth under its objective form. Reason and law work thus objectively in the constitution of the moral world, as a most real power lodged in the very structure of our collective life ; something which is in such view wholly different from all merely private intelligence, as well as independent of it while it is only by means of this at the same time that it can ever bring itself to pass or make itself felt. This objective revelation forms the medium accordingly, the necessary and only medium we may say, through which mind in its individual capacity is brought to communicate with truth in a truly living way. The communication is not separate and direct, but by the intervention rather of a more general rationality, in the bosom of which the single mind is of necessity born and matured and perpetually carried. Purely private reason is an absurdity ; and so just as much is private will. The absurdity is not relieved, however, by setting authority over against either, in the form of truth or in the form of law, in a purely abstract and outward view. The abstraction here is full as bad as the negation. The case calls for a concrete mediation of the single and the general. This we have in the actual structure of the human world ; where reason and law are found touching men continually, not in an abrupt and isolated way, (what Dr. Bushnell styles the *ictic* method,) but mediationally always, through the organism of the human life itself collectively taken, and by means of relations that bind the single subject indissolubly at all points to the great living, rational and

moral mass, of which he is a part and without which he can be nothing. God does not bring his will nigh to men in a direct way, but through some living constitution more broad and general than themselves, which they are bound, as well as naturally prompted, to regard and reverence for this very end. His authority utters itself through the family; through right public opinion; through art and science; through the civil state; through the course of history; and above all, though in full conformity with the same general law, in the Church catholic as this has stood from the time of the Apostles down to the present day, and is destined to stand also to the end of the world, the pillar and ground of the truth, against which the gates of hell can never prevail.

In this way, we recognize fully the vanity of mere private judgment, in the great business of religion, and the need of authority to assist us in settling rightly the high and solemn questions with which it is concerned. This authority too, we see plainly enough, must be something more than the letter of the Bible, as each man separately taken may have power to read it for his own use; since this necessarily resolves itself at last, under such view, into that very private judgment and will, from which the problem is to find some sufficient escape. It is in truth the essence of rationalism itself, to make the single mind, in such style, the source and measure of Christianity; and it is only a circumstance in the case, that the Bible may happen to be taken as the ostensible platform of such independent thinking, while another sort of rationalism sets this also aside, and falls back fairly and openly on its own resources in the most naked form. We acknowledge the need of something more here than the Bible, thus made the sport and plaything of private judgment. Christianity is a living fact in the world, which as such carries along with it, to the end of time, its own evidence and its own authority. In this form it constitutes the Church. We own and confess the authority of this body, the one holy catholic Church of the Creed, as both legitimate and necessary for the proper constitution of the Christian faith in all ages and lands. When those who would make the Bible *per se* the source of Christianity, refer us at the same time to the influence of the Holy Ghost as going along with it and securing its right use, we see clearly enough that all such illumination must be regarded as fanciful and vain, if it fall not in with the general law of our nature just noticed, by which the presence of truth for the individual mind is conditioned and mediated by its relations to mind in a more comprehensive view. We have no right



to conceive of the Spirit, as working in any such abstract way. It is against philosophy, against experience, and against the clear representations of the New Testament itself. As the Spirit of Christ especially, the medium of the new creation which began to be revealed on the day of Pentecost, he is at the same time the Spirit of his Church, the one and the self-same power that is active in all the saints, as they form collectively his mystical body, and are thus the fulness of him that filleth all in all. The authority of the Spirit then is to be expected and sought, like all other manifestations of God's will in the world, not under an abstract character, but under the form of concrete life; that is, in the bosom of the Church, by which and through which only it comes to such revelation. But now when the Romanists, to meet this acknowledged want, refer us to their Church outwardly considered, or to the Pope as its visible head, for an authority which is declared to be infallible at all points, and always at hand, for the solution of all religious questions, we seem to ourselves at least to encounter, under a slight change of aspect only, the very same difficulty we have wished to escape from on the opposite side. The Church or the Pope here is made to stand mechanically in the place of the Bible, as the organ of the Holy Ghost; whose authority is then supposed to reach over to the single believer, through such outward medium, in a purely abstract quasi-magical way, without any regard whatever to the standing order of our life, which demands in every such case, as we have seen, a concrete living revelation, by the force and power of which objectively the individual mind may be brought to assert a corresponding activity in a truly free way. We object not to the idea of authority in the case; but we wish an authority that may show itself truly moral, answerable to the constitution of humanity, compatible with the idea of freedom. No authority, it seems to us, can be of this character that is absolutely abstract, that comes upon the subject as an abrupt and isolated *mandamus* from a higher sphere. To be really from God, it must legitimate itself by entering the sphere of the life it seeks to rule; it must take concrete form in the world; it must win for itself a living human activity in the social system, which in the case before us becomes the Church, whereby it may have access to individual thought and will in conformity with the general law of our nature. Let it appear that the decisions of the Pope, though taken to be moved by the Holy Ghost, are the product in some way of the general life of Christianity, rationally working out the result through such central organ, according to the law of man's nature as otherwise known; and

we can at least listen patiently to the plea that is put in for his infallibility. But this is not the view that Romanism is willing to allow. The infallibility must be set quite above the standing order of our life. The authority is lifted clear out of the process of humanity, and in this way ceases to be concrete and historical altogether. It has no objective mediation in the actual constitution of the world. It is wholly abstract, transcendent, superhuman; and so in the end it is not moral; leaves no room for freedom; but runs into despotism, spiritual legerdemain, and magic.

We have never meant to deny the supernatural; nor yet to make it the same thing simply with the supersensible, the world of pure thought as distinguished from the world of sense. Our objection to Mr. Brownson is, not that he sets the supernatural out of nature over it and above it, but that this *transcendence*, in his hands is carried to the point of such an absolute disruption of the one world from the other as amounts at last to downright dualism, and leaves no room for the accomplishment of any real conjunction between them in the life of man; which, however, at the same time is the necessary conception of all religion, and the very form especially in which the idea of Christianity becomes complete. We see not how such a real conjunction should imply anything like a full sufficiency on the side of nature, left to itself for the actualization of the supernatural as its own product; but it does seem to us certainly to require a constitutional fitness and capability on the part of the first, for apprehending with some inward connatural grasp, the presence of this last when brought within its reach. We question not the full objectivity of the supernatural, as an order of life above nature; only we ask that a corresponding subjectivity be allowed also on the part of man, whereby he may be able to receive the object which is thus higher than himself into true union with his life, so as to be lifted by the power of it, not magically but rationally, into its own superior sphere. Such directly receptive capacity we take to be inherently at hand in the gift or faculty of faith. Faith carries in it a real inward living and rational correspondence with the truth it is called to embrace; and in this view it belongs to the proper original nature of man, though a divine influence is needed certainly to bring it into exercise. Such drawing out of the subjective capacity of our nature, however, by no means implies that the truth itself is drawn out in this way; just as little as the awakening of sight in a previously blind eye would imply, that the surrounding world was brought to pass by its becoming thus an object of vision. What else does our Saviour mean when he

says: No man can come to me, except the Father *draw* him; He that is of God, heareth God's words; If any man will do my will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God. For the reception of Christ, all depends on a certain inward sympathy and correspondence with the truth revealed in his person, a real receptivity for the supernatural on the side of the human soul itself, such as all men ought to have, but only some men have in fact.

To affirm such a rational correspondence between faith and its object, is not to affirm by any means the full intelligibility of this last for the human mind. The world of sense is not at once understood, by being apprehended as an object of sense. Still this apprehension carries in it the relation of a real inward connection with the intrinsic nature of what is thus perceived as real and true. So here. The object supernatural, according to the measure of each particular revelation, is substantiated and made to be real, not objectively of course but in the sphere of the human mind, by the power of faith, touching it, falling in with it, embracing it, and so admitting it into union with man's life, though it be still by no means fully comprehended. Faith is not itself the truth it embraces; just as little as the Holy Ghost is the same truth, in making way for it to the believer's soul; but it is nevertheless truly the very form under which truth exists *in the soul*, as the Holy Ghost also is the real medium by which such result is brought to pass. Supernatural truth is for man no truth at all except as it is "mixed with faith" in them that hear it. The language of St. Paul, Heb. xi. 1, taken in connection with the whole chapter, clearly implies, we think, that faith is such a power of grasping invisible and eternal things, as serves to authenticate them, and to make their reality actually felt, as truly as the things of sense are felt in their own way. By it, for instance, we know that the worlds were framed from nothing by the word of God. We get that by no ratiocination, and by no outward testimony; but in the form rather of a direct response on the part of our religious nature, to the word that addresses faith directly out from the constitution of the world itself.

But this, Mr. Brownson tells us, is to exclude *testimony*, as the necessary medium of faith. "Even Divine testimony is not to be credited, it seems, according to our German Reformed Doctor, till we have examined what it testifies to, and satisfied ourselves by our own light that it is true, and worthy to be believed" *p.* 204. But this is not a fair representation of our meaning. What we have objected to is the idea of a purely outward evidence in this form, coming between the believer and the truth

to be believed, and engaging his assent to this on grounds wholly extrinsic to the truth itself. Certainly we allow the testimony or word of God to be the true foundation of faith. The question is simply, how this testimony is to be obtained. *Can* it be conclusively ascertained in a purely abstract way, as something sure and full on the *outside* of the revelation to which it requires our assent; according to the view taken of faith, if we understand Mr. Brownson rightly, in the Roman system? We think not. The whole revelation, be it less or more, commencing with the miracle or primary seal and reaching out to all that is spoken, must be regarded as entering into the evidence by which the presence of the Divine Speaker is authenticated and his testimony accredited. This is not to make the word more certain than the Speaker, but only to set the Speaker before us under a form worthy of himself, and sufficient to command faith. When we have, in such circumstances, the Presence of God joined with its proper concrete relations, these serve of course to complete the evidence of the adorable fact; but it is still the Presence itself, as the centre of all, which at the same time legitimates and proves the reality of the whole revelation. So the world of Nature proclaims the being and glory of God; but only as the idea of God himself, discerned by faith, comes into view through Nature, and in the midst of it, to authenticate it as his own spoken handi-work and word. The miracle seals properly a Divine commission; but not abstractly; not magically; otherwise no direction could have been given, (Deut. xiii. 1-5,) to destroy a wonder-worker using such argument in favor of idolatry and falsehood. The miracle, to prove truth, must have a certain moral constitution; must be surrounded with right relations; must proceed from a worthy quarter and look to a worthy end.

So Christ stands commended to faith certainly by evidence *ab extra* as the Son of the living God; only however as he is himself the *Light*, which sheds on all such evidence its full significance and power. The knowledge which Peter had of Christ, (Matt. xvi. 17,) came not of course by mere sense; it was from God, and not in any way from flesh and blood; but still it was not a secret whispered in his ear in this form from beyond Christ's person. The truth was *there* before him, with self-authenticating force in Christ himself; and it was his peculiar privilege to see and feel *in Him* the living glorious **AMEKINAH** which he was in fact.

But here our limits require us to stop.

J. W. N.